This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

WORKS

OF THE

REV. JOHN WESLEY.

VOLUME XII.

Containing,

THE APPEALS TO MEN OF REASON AND RELIGION, ANSWERS TO MR. CHURCH'S REMARKS, &c. &c.

ASTOR LIBRARY NEW-YORK

London:

PRINTED AT THE CONFERENCE OFFICE, 14, CITY ROAD,
BY THOMAS CORDEUX, AGENT.
SOLD BY THOMAS BLANSHARD, 14, CITY-ROAD; ALSO, BY J. BUTTERWORTH, FLEET STREET; W. BAYNES AND J. HAMILTON, PATERNOSTER-ROW; AND W. KENT, HOLBORN.

1812.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XII.

		PAGE
I.	*An Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion* - - - -	1
II.	*A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, Part I. - - -	47
III.	*A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, Part II. - - -	148
IV.	*A Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, Part III. - . -	223
V.	*An Answer to Mr. Church's Remarks on Mr. Wesley's Fourth Journal* - -	281
VI.	*The Principles of the Methodists farther explained, occasioned by Mr. Church's Second Letter to Mr. Wesley* - -	328
VII.	*A Letter to the Bishop of London, occasioned by his Lordship's Charge to the Clergy* - - - -	41
VIII.	*A Letter to an Irish Clergyman* - -	42

AN

EARNEST APPEAL

TO MEN OF

REASON AND RELIGION.

Doth our Law judge any Man before it hear him, and know what he doth? JOHN vii. 51.

ALTHOUGH it is with us a "very small thing to be judged of you, or of man's judgment," seeing we know God will "make our INNOCENCY as clear as the light, and our JUST DEALING as the noon-day;" yet are we ready to give any that are willing to hear, a plain account both of our principles and actions: "as having renounced the hidden things of shame," and desiring nothing more, "than by manifestation of the truth to commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

2. We see (and who does not?) the numberless follies and miseries of our fellow-creatures. We see on every side, either men of no religion at all, or men of a lifeless, formal religion. We are grieved at the sight, and should greatly rejoice, if by any means we might convince some, that there is a better religion to be attained, a religion worthy of God that gave it. And this we conceive to be no other than love; the love of God and of all mankind, the loving God with all our heart, and soul, and strength, as having first loved *us*, as the Fountain of all the good we have received, and of all we ever hope to enjoy; and the loving every

soul which God hath made, every man on earth, as our own soul.

3. This love we believe to be the medicine of life, the never-failing remedy, for all the evils of a disordered world, for all the miseries and vices of men. Wherever this is, there are virtue and happiness, going hand in hand. There is humbleness of mind, gentleness, long-suffering, the whole image of God, and at the same time a peace that passeth all understanding, and joy unspeakable and full of glory.

"Eternal sunshine of the spotless mind;
Each prayer accepted, and each wish resign'd:
Desires compos'd, affections ever even,
Tears that delight, and sighs that waft to heaven."

4. This religion we long to see established in the world, a religion of love, and joy, and peace, having its seat in the heart, in the inmost soul, but ever shewing itself, by its fruits, continually springing forth not only in all innocence, (for love worketh no ill to his neighbour,) but likewise in every kind of beneficence, spreading virtue and happiness all around it.

5. This religion have we been following after for many years, as many know, if they would testify: but all this time, seeking wisdom we found it not; we were spending our strength in vain. And being now under full conviction of this, we declare it to all mankind: for we desire not that others should wander out of the way, as we have done before them; but rather that they may profit by our loss, that they may go, (though we did not, having then no man to guide us,) the straight way to the religion of love, even by faith.

6. Now faith (supposing the Scripture to be of God) is πραγματων ελεγχος ου βλεπομενων, *the demonstrative evidence of things unseen, the supernatural evidence of things invisible*, not perceivable by eyes of flesh, or by any of our natural senses or faculties. Faith is that divine evidence, whereby the spiritual man discerneth God and the things of God. It is with regard to the spiritual world, what sense is with regard to the natural. It is the spiritual sensation of every soul that is born of God.

7. Perhaps you have not considered it in this view; I will then explain it a little further.

Faith, according to the scriptural account, is the eye of the new-born soul. Hereby every true believer in God "seeth him who is invisible." Hereby (in a more particular manner, since life and immortality have been brought to light by the gospel) he "seeth the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ;" and "beholdeth what manner of love it is, which the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we (who are born of the Spirit) should be called the sons of God."

It is the ear of the soul, whereby a sinner "hears the voice of the Son of God and lives;" even that voice which alone wakes the dead, "Son, thy sins are forgiven thee."

It is (if I may be allowed the expression) the palate of the soul: for hereby a believer "tastes the good word, and the powers of the world to come;" and hereby he both tastes and sees that "God is gracious, yea and merciful to him a sinner."

It is the feeling of the soul, whereby a believer perceives, through "the power of the Highest overshadowing him," both the existence and the presence of Him, in whom "he lives, moves, and has his being;" and indeed the whole invisible world, the entire system of things eternal. And hereby, in particular, he feels "the love of God shed abroad in his heart."

8. "By this faith we are saved" from all uneasiness of mind, from the anguish of a wounded spirit, from discontent, from fear and sorrow of heart, and from that inexpressible listlessness and weariness, both of the world and of ourselves, which we had so helplessly laboured under for many years; especially when we were out of the hurry of the world, and sunk into calm reflection. In this we find that love of God, and of all mankind, which we had elsewhere sought in vain. This we know and feel, and therefore cannot but declare, saves every one that partakes of it, both from sin and misery, from every unhappy and every unholy temper.

"Soft peace she brings, wherever she arrives,
She builds our quiet, as she forms our lives;
Lays the rough paths of peevish nature even,
And opens in each breast a little heaven."

9. If you ask, "Why then have not all men this faith? All at least who conceive it to be so happy a thing? Why do they not believe immediately?"

We answer, (on the Scripture hypothesis,) "It is the gift of God." No man is able to work it in himself. It is a work of Omnipotence. It requires no less power thus to quicken a dead soul, than to raise a body that lies in the grave. It is a new creation, and none can create a soul anew but he who at first created the heavens and the earth.

10. May not your own experience teach you this? Can you give yourself this faith? Is it now in your power to see, or hear, or taste, or feel God? Have you already, or can you raise in yourself any perception of God, or of an invisible world? I suppose you do not deny that there is an invisible world: you will not charge it in poor old Hesiod, to Christian prejudice of education, when he says, in those well known words,

"Millions of unseen creatures walk the earth
Unseen, whether we wake, or if we sleep."

Now, is there any power in your soul, whereby you discern either these, or him that created them? Or can all your wisdom and strength open an intercourse between yourself and the world of spirits? Is it in your power to burst the veil that is on your heart, and let in the light of eternity? You know it is not. You not only do not, but cannot (by your own strength) thus believe. The more you labour so to do, the more you will be convinced "it is the gift of God."

11. It is the *free gift* of God, which he bestows not on those who are *worthy* of his favour, not on such as are *previously holy*, and so *fit* to be crowned with all the blessings of his goodness: but on the ungodly and unholy: on those who till that hour were *fit* only for everlasting destruction:

those in whom was no good thing, and whose only plea was, "God, be merciful to me a sinner." No merit, no goodness in man precedes the forgiving love of God. His pardoning mercy supposes nothing in us but a sense of mere sin and misery: and to all who see and feel, and own their wants, and their utter inability to remove them, God freely gives faith, for the sake of him "in whom he is always well pleased."

12. This is a short, rude sketch of the doctrine we teach. These are our fundamental principles; and we spend our lives in confirming others herein, and in a behaviour suitable to them.

Now, if you are a reasonable man, although you do not believe the Christian system to be of God, lay your hand upon your breast, and calmly consider, What is it that you can here condemn? What evil have we done to *you*, that *you* should join the common cry against us? Why should *you* say, "Away with such fellows from the earth: it is not fit that they should live?"

13. It is true, your judgment does not fall in with ours. We believe the Scripture to be of God. This you do not believe. And how do you defend yourself against them who urge you with the guilt of unbelief? Do you not say, "Every man *must* judge according to the light he has, and that if he be true to this, he ought not to be condemned?" Keep then to this, and turn the tables. *Must* not *we* also judge according to the light we have? You can in no wise condemn *us*, without involving *yourself* in the same condemnation. According to the light *we* have, we cannot but believe the Scripture is of God; and, while we believe this, we dare not turn aside from it, to the right hand or to the left.

14. Let us consider this point a little farther. You yourself believe there is a God. You have the witness of this in your own breast. Perhaps sometimes you tremble before him. You believe there is such a thing as right and wrong, that there is a difference between moral good and evil. Of consequence, you must allow there is such a thing as con-

science: I mean, that every person capable of reflection, is conscious to himself, when he looks back on any thing he has done, whether it be good or evil. You must likewise allow, that every man is to be guided by his own conscience, not another's. Thus far, doubtless, you may go, without any danger of being a *volunteer* in faith.

15. Now then, be consistent with yourself. If there be a God, who being just and good, (attributes inseparable from the very idea of God,) is "a rewarder of them that diligently seek him," ought we not to do whatever we believe will be acceptable to so good a Master? Observe: if we *believe*, if we are fully persuaded of this in our own mind, ought we not thus to seek him, and that with all diligence? Else how should we expect any reward at his hands?

16. Again: ought we not to do what we believe is morally good, and to abstain from what we judge is evil? By good, I mean conducive to the good of mankind, tending to advance peace, and good-will among men, promotive of the happiness of our fellow-creatures; and by evil, what is contrary thereto. Then surely you cannot condemn our endeavouring after our power, to make mankind happy; (I now speak only with regard to the present world,) our striving, as we can, to lessen their sorrows, and to teach them, in whatsoever state they are, therewith to be content.

17. Yet again. Are we to be guided by *our own* conscience, or by that of *other* men? *You* surely will not say, that any man's conscience can preclude *mine*. You, at least, will not plead for robbing *us*, of what you strongly claim for yourselves. I mean, the right of private judgment, which is indeed unalienable from reasonable creatures. *You* well know, that unless we faithfully follow the dictates of *our own* mind, we cannot have a conscience void of offence toward God and towards man.

18. Upon your own principles, therefore, you must allow us to be, at least, *innocent*. Do you find any difficulty in this? You speak much of prepossession and prejudice,

beware you are not entangled therein yourselves. Are you not prejudiced against *us*, because we believe and strenuously defend that system of doctrines which you oppose? Are you not enemies to *us*, because you take it for granted we are so to *you?* Nay, God forbid! I once saw one, who, from a plentiful fortune, was reduced to the lowest extremity. He was lying on a sick-bed, in violent pain, without even convenient food, or one friend to comfort him; so that when his merciful landlord, to complete all, sent one to take his bed from under him, I was not surprised at his attempt to put an end to so miserable a life. Now, when I saw that poor man, weltering in his blood, could I be angry at him? Surely no. No more can I at *you*. I can no more hate than I can envy you. I can only lift up my heart to God for *you*, (as I did then for him,) and with silent tears, beseech the Father of mercies, that he would look on you in your blood, and say unto you, *Live*.

16. "Sir, (said that unhappy man, at my first interview with him,) I scorn to deceive you or any man. You must not tell me of your Bible; for I don't believe one word of it. I know there is a God, and believe he is all and in all, the *Anima Mundi*, the

"*Vastam*
Mens agitans molem, et magno se corpore miscens."

"But farther than this, I believe not; all is dark; my thought is lost. But I hear (added he) you preach to a great number of people every night and morning. Pray, what would you do with them? Whither would you lead them? What religion do you preach? What is it good for?" I replied, "I do preach to as many as desire to hear, every night and morning. You ask, "What I would do with them?" I would make them virtuous and happy, easy in themselves, and useful to others. "Whither would I lead them?" To heaven, to God the Judge, the lover of all; and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant. "What religion do I preach?" The religion of love: the law of kindness brought to light by the gospel. "What is this good for?" To make all who receive it enjoy God and themselves: to make

them like God; lovers of all; contented in their lives; and crying out at their death, in calm assurance, "O grave, where is thy victory! Thanks be unto God, who giveth *me* the victory, through my Lord Jesus Christ."

20. Will you object to such a religion as this; that it is not reasonable? Is it not reasonable then to love God? Hath he not given you life, and breath, and all things? Does he not still continue his love to you, filling your heart with food and gladness? What have you which you have not received of him? And does not love demand a return of love? Whether, therefore, you *do* love God or not, you cannot but own it is reasonable so to do; nay, seeing he is the Parent of all good, to love him with all your heart.

21. Is it not reasonable also to love our neighbour? Every man whom God hath made? Are we not brethren? The children of one Father? Ought we not then to love one another? And, should we only love them that love us? Is that acting like our Father which is in heaven? He causeth his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. And can there be a more equitable rule of our love, than "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself?" You will *plead* for the reasonableness of this; as also for that golden rule, (the only adequate measure of brotherly love, in all our words and actions,) "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do unto them."

Is it not reasonable then, that "as we have opportunity, we should do good to all men?" Not only friends, but enemies, not only to the deserving, but likewise to the evil and unthankful. Is it not right that all our life should be one continued labour of love? If a day passes without doing good, may one not well say, with Titus, **Amici, diem perdidi!* And is it enough, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to visit those who are sick or in prison? Should we have no pity for those

"Who sigh beneath guilt's horrid stain,
The worst confinement, and the heaviest chain?"

* *My friends, I have lost a day!*

Should we shut up our compassion toward those who are of all men most miserable, because they are miserable by their own fault? If we have found a medicine to heal even that sickness, should we not, as we have freely received it, freely give? Should we not pluck them as brands out of the fire? The fire of lust, anger, malice, revenge? Your inmost soul answers, It should be done; it is reasonable in the highest degree. Well, this is the sum of our preaching, and of our lives, our enemies themselves being the judges. If therefore you allow, that it is reasonable to love God, to love mankind, and to do good to all men, you cannot but allow, that religion which we preach and live, to be agreeable to the highest reason.

23. Perhaps "all this you can bear. It is tolerable enough: and if we spoke only of being *saved by love*, you should have no great objection: but you do not comprehend what we say of being *saved by faith*." I know you do not. You do not in any degree comprehend what we mean by that expression; have patience then, and I will tell you yet again. By those words, *we are saved by faith*, we mean, that the moment a man receives that faith which is above described, he is saved from doubt and fear, and sorrow of heart, by a peace that passes all understanding; from the heaviness of a wounded spirit, by joy unspeakable; and from his sins, of whatsoever kind they were; from his vicious desires, as well as words and actions, by the love of God and of all mankind, then shed abroad in his heart.

24. We grant nothing is more unreasonable, than to imagine that such mighty effects as these can be wrought by that poor, empty, insignificant thing which the world *calls* faith. But supposing there be such a faith on the earth, as that which the apostle speaks of, such an intercourse between God and the soul, what is too hard for such a faith? You may easily conceive, that "all things are possible to him that thus believeth:" to him that thus *walks with God*, that is now a citizen of heaven, an inhabitant of eternity. If therefore you will contend

with *us*, you must change the ground of your attack. You must flatly deny, there is any faith upon earth: but perhaps this you might think too large a step. You cannot do this, without a secret condemnation in your own breast. O that you would at length cry to God for that heavenly gift! whereby alone this truly reasonable religion, this beneficent love of God and man can be planted in your heart.

25. If you say, "But those that profess this faith, are the most unreasonable of all men;" I ask, "Who are those that profess this faith?" Perhaps you do not personally know such a man in the world. Who are they that so much as profess to have *this evidence* of things not seen? That profess to *see him that is invisible?* To *hear the voice* of God, and to have *his Spirit* ever "witnessing with their spirits, that they are the children of God?" I fear you will find few that even profess *this faith*, among the large numbers of those who are called believers.

26. "However, there are enow that profess themselves Christians." Yea, too many, God knoweth; too many that confute their vain professions, by the whole tenor of their lives. I will allow all you can say on this head, and perhaps more than all. It is now some years since I was engaged unawares in a conversation with a strong reasoner, who at first urged the wickedness of the American Indians, as a bar to our hope of converting them to Christianity. But when I mentioned their temperance, justice, and veracity, (according to the accounts I had then received,) it was asked, "Why, if those heathens are such men as these, what will they gain by being made Christians? What would they gain by being *such Christians* as we see every where round about us?" I could not deny, they would lose, not gain, by such a Christianity as this. Upon which she added, "Why, what else do you mean by Christianity?" My plain answer was, What do you apprehend to be more valuable than good sense, good nature, and good manners? All these are contained, and that in the highest degree, in what I mean by Christianity. Good sense (so called) is

but a poor, dim shadow of what Christians call faith. Good nature is only a faint, distant resemblance of Christian charity. And good manners, if of the most finished kind that nature assisted by art can attain to, is but a dead picture of that holiness of conversation, which is the image of God visibly expressed. All these put together by the art of God, I call Christianity. "Sir, if this be Christianity, (said my opponent in amaze,) I never saw a Christian in my life."

27. Perhaps, the case is the same with *you*. If so, I am grieved for you, and can only wish, till you do see a living proof of this, that you would not say, *see a Christian*. For this is scriptural Christianity, and this alone. Whenever therefore you see an unreasonable man, you see one who perhaps calls himself by that name, but *is* no more a *Christian* than he is an *angel*. So far as he departs from true, genuine reason, so far he departs from Christianity. Do not say, this is only asserted, not proved. It is undeniably proved by the original charter of Christianity. We appeal to this, to the written word. If any man's temper, or words, or actions, are contradictory to right reason; it is evident to a demonstration, they are contradictory to this. Produce any possible or conceivable instance, and you will find the fact is so. The lives, therefore, of those who are *called* Christians, is no just objection to Christianity.

28. We join with you then in desiring a religion founded on reason, and every way agreeable thereto. But one question still remains to be asked, What do you mean by *Reason?* I suppose you mean the eternal reason, or, the nature of things: the nature of God and the nature of man, with the relations necessarily subsisting between them. Why, this is the very religion *we* preach: a religion evidently founded on, and every way agreeable to eternal reason, to the essential nature of things. Its foundation stands on the nature of God and the nature of man, together with their mutual relations. And it is every way suitable thereto: to the nature of God; for it begins in knowing him, and where, but in the true knowledge of God, can

you conceive true religion to begin? It goes on in loving him and all mankind, (for you cannot but imitate whom you love:) It ends in serving him; in doing his will; in obeying him whom we know and love.

29. It is every way suited to the nature of man: for it begins in man's knowing himself; knowing himself to be what he really is, foolish, vicious, miserable. It goes on to point out the remedy for this, to make him, truly wise; virtuous, and happy; as every thinking mind (perhaps from some implicit remembrance of what it originally was) longs to be.

It finishes all, by restoring the due relations between God and man; by uniting for ever the tender Father, and the grateful, obedient son; the great Lord of all, and the faithful servant, doing not his own will, but the will of him that sent him.

30. But perhaps by reason you mean, the faculty of reasoning, of inferring one thing from another. There are many, it is confessed, (particularly those who are styled Mystic Divines,) that utterly decry the use of reason, thus understood, in religion: nay, that condemn all reasoning concerning the things of God, as utterly destructive of true religion. But we can in no wise agree with this. We find no authority for it in holy writ. So far from it, that we find there both our Lord and his Apostles continually reasoning with their opposers. Neither do we know, in all the productions of ancient and modern times, such a chain of reasoning or argumentation, so close, so solid, so regularly connected, as the Epistle to the Hebrews. And the strongest reasoner whom we have ever observed (excepting only Jesus of Nazareth) was that Paul of Tarsus; the same who has left that plain direction for all Christians, "In malice," or wickedness, "be ye children; but in understanding," or reason, "be ye men."

31. We therefore not only allow, but earnestly exhort all who seek after true religion, to use all the reason which God hath given them, in searching out the things of God.

But your *reasoning justly*, not only on this, but on any subject whatsoever, pré-supposes a *true judgment* already formed, whereon to ground your argumentation. Else, you know, you will stumble at every step: because *ex falso non sequitur verum*. It is impossible, if your premises are false, to infer from them true conclusions.

32. You know likewise, that before it be possible for you to form a *true judgment* of them, it is absolutely necessary, that you should have a *clear apprehension* of the things of God, and that your ideas thereof should be all *fixed*, *distinct*, and *determinate*. And seeing our *ideas* are not innate, but must all originally come from our *senses*, it is certainly necessary that you have *senses* capable of discerning objects of this kind. Not those only which are called *natural senses*, which in this respect profit nothing, as being altogether incapable of discerning objects of a spiritual kind, but *spiritual senses*, exercised to discern spiritual good and evil. It is necessary that you have *the hearing ear*, and the *seeing eye*, emphatically so called; that you have a new class of senses opened in your soul, not depending on organs of flesh and blood, to be *the evidence* of things not seen, as your bodily senses are of visible things; to be the avenues to the invisible world, to discern spiritual objects, and to furnish you with ideas of what the outward "eye hath not seen, neither the ear heard."

33. And till you have these *internal senses*, till the eyes of your understanding are opened, you can have no proper *apprehension* of divine things, no just *idea* of them. Nor consequently, till then, can you either *judge truly*, or *reason justly* concerning them: seeing your Reason has no ground whereon to stand, no materials to work upon.

34. To use the trite instance. As you cannot *reason* concerning colours, if you have no *natural sight*, because all the *ideas* received by your other senses are of a different kind; so that neither your *hearing*, nor any *other sense*, can supply your want of *sight*, or furnish your reason in this respect with matter to work upon: so you cannot *reason* concerning spiritual things, if you have no *spiritual sight*; because all

your ideas received by your *outward senses* are of a different kind. Yea, far more different from those received by faith or *internal sensation*, than the idea of colour from that of sound. These are only different species of one genus, namely, sensible ideas, received by external sensation: whereas the ideas of faith differ *toto genere* from those of *external sensation*. So that it is not conceivable that *external sensation* should supply the want of *internal senses*; or furnish your *reason* in this respect with matter to work upon.

35. What then will your reason do here? How will it pass from things natural to things spiritual! From the things that are seen to those that are not seen! From the visible to the invisible world! What a gulf is here! By what art will reason get over the immense chasm? This cannot be till the Almighty come in to succour, and give you that Faith you have hitherto despised. Then upborne as it were upon eagles' wings, you shall soar away into the regions of eternity; and your enlightened reason shall explore even "the deep things of God," God himself "revealing them to you by his Spirit."

36. I expected to have received much light on this head, from a treatise lately published, and earnestly recommended to me, I mean, *Christianity not founded on Argument*. But on a careful perusal of that piece, notwithstanding my prejudice in its favour, I could not but perceive, that the great design uniformly pursued throughout the work, was to render the whole of the Christian Institution both odious and contemptible. In order to this, the author gleans up with great care and diligence, the most plausible of those many objections that have been raised against it by late writers, and proposes them with the utmost strength of which he was capable. To do this with the more effect, he *personates* a Christian: he *makes a shew* of defending an avowed doctrine of Christianity, namely, the supernatural influence of the Spirit of God; and often, for several sentences together, (indeed in the beginning of almost every paragraph,) speaks so *like a Christian*, that not a few have

received him according to his wish. Mean while, with all possible *art* and *show of reason*, and in the most laboured language, he pursues his point throughout, which is to prove, "that Christianity is contrary to reason;" or, "that no man acting according to the principles of reason, can possibly be a Christian."

37. It is a wonderful proof of the power that smooth words may have even on serious minds, that so many have mistook such a writer as this for a friend of Christianity: since almost every page of his tract is filled with gross falsehood and broad blasphemy: and these supported by such *exploded* fallacies, and *common place* sophistry, that a person of two or three years standing in the university, might give them a sufficient answer, and make the author appear as *irrational* and contemptible as he labours to make Christ and his apostles.

38. I have hitherto spoken to those, chiefly, who do not receive the Christian system as of God. I would add a few words to another set of men; (though not so much with regard to *our* principles or practice, as with regard to *their own:)* to you who *do* receive it, who believe the Scripture, but yet do not take upon you the character of *religious men.* I am therefore obliged to address myself to you likewise, under the character of *men of reason.*

39. I would only ask, Are you such indeed? Do you answer the character under which you appear? If so, you are consistent with yourselves. Your principles and practice agree together.

Let us try whether this be so or not. Do you take the name of God in vain? Do you remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy? Do you not speak evil of the ruler of your people? Are you not a drunkard, or a glutton, faring as sumptuously as you can every day? Making a god of your belly? Do you not avenge yourself? Are you not a whoremonger or adulterer? Answer plainly to your own heart, before God the Judge of all.

Why then do you say, you truly believe the Scripture?

If the Scripture be true, you are lost. You are in the broad way that leadeth to destruction. Your damnation slumbereth not. You are heaping up to yourself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God. Doubtless, if the Scripture be true, (and you remain thus,) it had been good for you if you had never been born.

40. How is it that you call yourselves men of reason? Is reason inconsistent with itself? You are the farthest of all men under the sun from any pretence to that character. A common swearer, a sabbath breaker, a whoremonger, a drunkard, who says he believes the Scripture is of God, is a monster upon earth, the greatest contradiction to his own, as well as to the reason of all mankind. In the name of God, (that worthy name whereby you are *called*, and which you daily cause to be blasphemed,) turn either to the right hand or to the left. Either profess you are an infidel, or be a Christian. Halt no longer thus between two opinions. Either cast off the Bible, or your sins. And in the mean time, if you have any spark of your boasted reason left, do not *count us your enemies* (as I fear you have done hitherto, and as thousands do wherever we have declared, "they who do such things shall not inherit eternal life,") *because we tell you the truth:* seeing these are not our words, but the words of him that sent us. Yea, though in doing this, we use *great plainness of speech*, as becomes the ministry we have received. "For we are not as many who corrupt" (cauponize, soften, and thereby adulterate) "the word of God. But as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ."

41. But it may be, you are none of these. You abstain from all such things. You have an unspotted reputation. You are a man of honour, or a woman of virtue. You scorn to do an unhandsome thing, and are of an unblamable life and conversation. You are harmless (if I understand you right) and useless from morning to night. You do no hurt,—and no good to any one, no more than a straw floating upon the water. Your life glides smoothly on from

year to year; and from one season to another, having no occasion to work,

"You waste away
In gentle inactivity the day."

42. I will not now shock the easiness of your temper, by talking about a future state. But suffer me to ask you a question about present things. Are you now happy? I have seen a large company of *reasonable creatures* called *Indians*, sitting in a row on the side of a river, looking sometimes at one another, sometimes at the sky, and sometimes at the bubbles on the water. And so they sat (unless in the time of war) for a great part of the year, from morning to night. These were doubtless much at ease. But can you think they were happy? And how little happier are you than they?

43. You eat, and drink, and sleep, and dress, and dance, and sit down to play. You are carried abroad. You are at the masquerade, the theatre, the opera-house, the park, the levee, the drawing-room. What do you do there? Why sometimes you talk: sometimes you look at one another. And what are you to do to-morrow? The next day? The next week? The next year? You are to eat, and drink, and sleep, and dance, and dress, and play again. And you are to be carried abroad again, that you may look at one another! And is this all? Alas, how little more happiness have you in this, than the Indians in looking at the sky or water! Ah, poor dull round! I do not wonder that Col. M——, (or any man of reflection,) should prefer death itself, even in the midst of his years, to such a life as this! and should frankly declare, "that he chose to go out of the world, because he found nothing in it worth living for."

44. Yet it is certain there is business to be done: and many we find in all places, (not to speak of the vulgar, the drudges of the earth,) who are continually employed therein. Are you of that number? Are you engaged in trade, or some other reputable employment? I suppose, profitable too; for you would not spend your time, and labour, and thought, for nothing. You are then making

your fortune: you are getting money. True: but money is not your ultimate end. The treasuring up gold and silver, for its own sake, all men own, is as foolish and absurd, as grossly unreasonable, as the treasuring up spiders, or the wings of butterflies. You consider this but as a means to some further end. And what is that? Why, the enjoying yourself, the being at ease, the taking your pleasure, the living like a gentleman. That is plainly, either the whole, or some part of the happiness above described. Supposing then your end to be actually attained, suppose you have your wish, before you drop into eternity: go and sit down with Thleeanowhee and his companions on the river side. After you have toiled for fifty years, you are just as happy as they.

45. Are you, can you, or any reasonable man, be *satisfied* with this? You are not. It is not possible you should. But what else can you do? You *would* have something better to employ your time; but you know not where to find it upon earth. And indeed it is obvious, that the Earth, as it is now constituted, even with the help of all European arts, does not find sufficient employment, to take up half the waking hours of half its inhabitants! What then can yon do? How can you employ the time that lies so heavy upon your hands? This very thing which you seek, declare we unto you. The thing *you* want, is the religion *we* preach. That alone leaves no time upon our hands. It fills up all the blank spaces of life. It exactly takes up all the time we have to spare, be it more or less: so that "he that hath much, hath nothing over, and he that has little, has no lack."

46. Once more. Can you (or any man of reason) think, you were made for the life you now lead? You cannot possibly think so; at least, not till you tread the Bible under foot. The oracles of God bear thee witness in every page, (and thine own heart agreeth thereto,) that thou wast made in the Image of God, an incorruptible picture of the God of glory. And what art thou even in thy present state? An everlasting spirit, going to God. For what end then did he create thee, but to dwell with him above this perish-

able world, to know him, to love him, to do his will, to enjoy him for ever and ever! O look more deeply into thyself! and into that Scripture, which thou professest to receive as the *the word of God*, as *right concerning all things*. There thou wilt find a nobler, happier state described, than it ever yet entered into thy heart to conceive. But God hath now revealed it to all those who "rejoice evermore, and pray without ceasing, and in every thing give thanks," and "do his will on earth as it is done in heaven." For this thou wast made. Hereunto also thou art called. O be not disobedient unto the heavenly calling! At least, be not angry with those who would fain bring thee to be a living witness of that religion, "whose ways are" indeed "ways of pleasantness, and all her paths, peace."

47. Do you say in your heart, "I know all this already? I am not barely a man of reason. I am a religious man: for I not only avoid evil and do good, but use all the means of grace. I am constantly at church, and at the sacrament too. I say my prayers every day. I read many good books. I fast every *Thirtieth of January and Good Friday*." Do you indeed? Do you do all this? This you may do: You may go thus far, and yet have *no religion* at all; *no such religion* as avails before God. Nay, much farther than this, than you have ever gone yet, or so much as thought of going. For you may "give all your goods to feed the poor," yea, "your body to be burned, and yet" very possibly, if St. Paul be a judge, "have no charity," no true religion.

48. This religion, which alone is of value before God, is the very thing you want. You want (and in wanting this, you want all) the religion of love. You do not love your neighbour as yourself, no more than you love God with all your heart. Ask your own heart now, if it be not so? It is plain you do not love God. If you did, you would be happy in him. But you know you are not happy. Your *formal* religion no more makes you happy, than your neighbour's *gay* religion does him. O how much have you suffered for want of plain dealing! Can you now bear to

hear the naked truth? You have *the form of Godliness*, but not the *power*. You are a mere whited wall. Before the Lord your God I ask you, Are you not? Too sure. For your "inward parts are very wickedness." You love "the creature more than the Creator." You are "a lover of pleasure more than a lover of God." A lover of God! You do not love God at all, no more than you love a stone. You love the world; therefore "the love of the Father is not in you."

49. You are on the brink of the pit, ready to be plunged into everlasting perdition. Indeed you have a zeal for God; but not according to knowledge. O how terribly have you been deceived! Posting to hell, and fancying it was heaven. See at length that *outward religion* without *inward*, is nothing; is far worse than nothing, being indeed no other than a solemn mockery of God. And *inward religion you have not*. You have not the faith *that worketh by love*. Your *faith* (so called) is no living, saving principle. It is not the Apostle's faith, "the substance" (or *subsistence*) "of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." So far from it, that *this* faith is the very thing which you call *enthusiasm*. You are not content with being without it, unless you blaspheme it too. You even revile that *life which is hid with Christ in God;* all seeing, tasting, hearing, feeling God. These things are *foolishness unto you*. No marvel; "for they are spiritually discerned."

50. Oh! no longer shut your eyes against the light. Know you have a name that you live, but are dead. Your soul is utterly dead in sin; dead in pride, in vanity, in self-will, in sensuality, in love of the world. You are utterly dead to God. There is no intercourse between your soul and God. "You have neither seen him," (by faith, as our Lord witnessed against them of old time,) "nor heard his voice at any time." You have no spiritual "senses exercised to discern spiritual good and evil." You are angry at infidels, and are all the while as mere an infidel before God as they. You have "eyes that see not, and ears that hear not." You have a *callous, unfeeling* heart.

51. Bear with me a little longer: my soul is distressed for you. "The god of this world hath blinded your eyes," and you are "seeking death in the error of your life." Because you do not commit gross sin, because you give alms, and go to the Church and Sacrament, you imagine that you are serving God; yet in very deed you are serving the devil. For you are doing still your own will, not the will of God your Saviour. You are pleasing yourself in all you do. Pride, vanity, and self-will, (the genuine fruits of an earthly, sensual, devilish heart,) pollute all your words and actions. You are in darkness, in the shadow of death. Oh! that God would say to you in thunder, "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."

52. But, blessed be God! He hath not yet left himself without witness!

"All are not lost! There be, who faith prefer,
Though few, and piety to God!"

Who know the power of faith, and are no strangers to that inward, vital religion, *the mind that was in Christ*, "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Of you who have "tasted the good word of God, and the power of the world to come," we would be glad to learn, if we have *erred from the faith*, or walked contrary to *the truth as it is in Jesus*. "Let the righteous smite me friendly, and reprove me;" if haply that which is amiss may be done away, and what is wanting supplied, till we all come to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

53. Perhaps the first thing that now occurs to your mind, relates to the doctrine which we teach. You have heard, that we say, "Men may live without sin." And have you not heard, that the Scripture says the same? (we mean without committing sin.) Does not St. Paul say plainly, that those who believe, do not continue in sin?—That they cannot "live any longer therein?" Rom. vi. 1, 2. Does not St. Peter say, "He that suffereth in the flesh, hath ceased from sin?---that he no longer should live---to the desires of men, but to the will of God," 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2. And

does not St. John say most expressly, "He that committeth sin is of the devil:---For this purpose the Son of God was manifest, that he might destroy the works of the devil? Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin: for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot commit sin, because he is born of God," 1 John iii. 8, &c. And again, "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not," ch. v. 18.

54. You see then, it is not we that say this, but the Lord. These are not our words but his. And who is he that replieth against God? Who is able to make God a liar? Surely he will be justified in his saying, and clear when he is judged! Can you deny it? Have you not often felt a secret check, when you were contradicting this great truth? And how often have you wished for what you were taught to deny? Nay, can you help wishing for it at this moment? Do you not now earnestly desire to cease from sin? To commit it no more? Does not your soul pant after this glorious liberty of the sons of God? And what strong reason have you to expect it? Have you not had a foretaste of it already? Do you not remember the time when God first lifted up the light of his countenance upon you? Can it ever be forgotten? The day when the candle of the Lord first shone upon your head?

"Butter and honey did you eat,
And lifted up on high,
You saw the clouds beneath your feet,
And rode upon the sky.
Far, far above all earthly things,
Triumphantly you rode;
You soar'd to heaven on eagles' wings,
And found, and talk'd with God."

You then had power not to commit sin. You found the Apostle's words strictly true, "he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." But those whom you took to be experienced Christians, telling you, "This was only the time of your espousals: this could not last always; you must come down from the

mount," and the like, shook your faith, You looked at men more than God, and so became weak, and like another man. Whereas, had you then had any to guide you according to the truth of God, had you then heard the doctrine which now you blame, you would never have fallen from your steadfastness; but have found, that in this sense also, the gifts and callings of God are without repentance.

55. Have you not another objection, nearly allied to this, namely, that we preach perfection? True; but what perfection? The term you cannot object to; because it is scriptural. All the difficulty is, to fix the meaning of it according to the word of God. And this we have done again and again, declaring to all the world, that Christian Perfection does not imply an exemption from ignorance or mistake, or infirmities, or temptations: but that it does imply, the being so crucified with Christ, as to be able to testify, "I live not, but Christ liveth in me," (Gal. ii. 23;) and hath "purified my heart by faith," (Acts xv. 9.) It does imply "the casting down every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." It does imply, "the being holy, as he that called us is holy, in all manner of conversation," (2 Cor. x. 5. 1 Peter i. 15.) And, in a word, "the loving the Lord our God with all our heart, and serving him with all our strength."

56. Now, is it possible for any who believe the Scripture, to deny one tittle of this? You cannot.---You dare not.---You would not for the world.---You know it is the pure word of God.---And this is the whole of what we preach; this is the height and depth of what we (with St. Paul) call Perfection: a state of soul devoutly to be wished, by all who have tasted of the love of God. O pray for it without ceasing. It is the one thing you want. Come with boldness to the throne of grace, and be assured that when you ask this of God, you shall have the petition you ask of him. We know indeed that to man, to the natural man, this is impossible. But we know also, that as no work is impossible with God, so all things are possible to him that believeth.

57. For we are sayed by faith. But have you not heard this urged as another objection against us, that we preach salvation by faith alone? And does not St. Paul do the same thing? *By grace*, saith he, *ye are saved, through faith.* Can any words be more express? And elsewhere, *Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*, Acts xvi. 31. What we mean by this (if it has not been sufficiently explained already) is, that we are saved from our sins, only by a confidence in the love of God. As soon as we "behold what manner of love it is which the Father hath bestowed upon us, we love him (as the Apostle observes) because he first loved us." And then is that commandment written in our heart, that *he who loveth God, should love his brother also:* from which love of God and man, meekness, humbleness of mind, and all holy tempers, spring. Now these are the very essence of salvation, of Christian salvation from sin. And from these, outward salvation flows; that is, holiness of life and conversation. Well, and are not these things so? If you know in whom you have believed, you need no further witnesses.

58. But perhaps you doubt, whether that faith whereby we are thus saved, implies such a trust and confidence in God as we describe: "You cannot think faith implies assurance: an assurance of the love of God to our souls, of his being now reconciled to us, and having forgiven all our sins." And this we freely confess, that if number of voices be to decide the question, we must give it up at once; for you have on your side, not only some who desire to be Christians indeed, but all nominal Christians in every place, and the Romish church, one and all. Nay, these last are so vehement in your defence, that in the famed council of Trent, they have decreed, "If any man hold *(fiduciam)* trust, confidence, or assurance of pardon to be essential to faith, let him be accursed."

59. Thus does that council anathematize the Church of England. For she is convicted hereof, by her own confession. The very words in the Homily on Salvation are, "Even the devils believe, that Christ was born of a virgin:

that he wrought all kinds of miracles, declaring himself very God; that for our sakes he suffered a most painful death, to redeem us from death everlasting. These articles of our faith, the devils believe; and so they believe all that was written in the Old and New Testament. And yet for all this faith, they be but devils. They remain still in their damnable estate, lacking the very true, Christian faith." "The right and true Christian faith is, not only to believe the Holy Scriptures and the Articles of our faith are true, but also to have a sure trust and confidence to be saved from everlasting damnation through Christ." Or, (as it is expressed a little after,) "A sure trust and confidence which a man hath in God, that by the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God."

60. Indeed the Bishop of Rome saith, "If any man hold this, let him be Anathema Maran-atha." But it is to be hoped, Papal Anathemas do not move you. You are a member of the Church of England. Are you? Then the controversy is at an end. Then hear the Church.—"Faith is a sure trust which a man hath in God, that his sins are forgiven." Or if you are not, whether you hear our Church or not, at least, hear the Scriptures. Hear believing Job, declaring his faith, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." Hear Thomas, (when having seen, *he believed,*) crying out, *My Lord and my God.* Hear St. Paul clearly describing the nature of his faith, "The life I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." Hear (to mention no more) all the believers who were with Paul when he wrote to the Colossians, bearing witness, "We give thanks unto the Father, who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: *in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins,*" ch. i. ver. 12, 13, 14.

61. But what need have we of distant witnesses? You have a witness in your own breast. For am I not speaking to one that loves God? How came you then to love him at first? Was it not because you knew that he loved you?

Did you, could you love God at all, till you tasted and saw that he was gracious? That he was merciful to you a sinner? What avails then controversy or strife of words? Out of thy own mouth! You own, you had no love to God, till you were sensible of his love to you. And whatever expressions any sinner that loves God uses, to denote God's love to him, you will always, upon examination, find, that they directly or indirectly imply forgiveness. Pardoning love is still at the root of all. He who was offended is now reconciled. The new song which God puts in every mouth, is always to that effect, "O Lord, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away. Behold, God is my salvation. I will trust and not be afraid; for the Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song: he is also become my salvation," Isa. xii. 1, 2.

62. A confidence, then, in a pardoning God, is essential to true faith. The forgiveness of sins is one of the first of those unseen things, whereof faith is the evidence. And if you are sensible of this, will you quarrel with us concerning an indifferent circumstance of it? Will you think it an important objection that we assert, that this faith is usually given in a moment? First, let me intreat you to read over that authentic account of God's dealings with men, the Acts of the Apostles. In this treatise you will find, how he wrought from the beginning on those who received remission of sins by faith. And can you find one of these (except perhaps St. Paul) who did not receive it in a moment? But abundance you find of those who did, besides Cornelius and the three thousand. And to this also agrees the experience of those who now receive the heavenly gift. Three or four exceptions only have I found in the course of several years. But all the rest of those, who from time to time among us have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, were, in a moment, brought from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

63. And why should it seem a thing incredible to you, who have known the power of God unto salvation; (whether he hath wrought thus in your soul or not; "for there

are diversities of operations, but the same spirit,") that "the dead should hear the voice of the Son of God," and in that moment live? Thus he useth to act, to shew that when he willeth, to do is present with him. "Let there be light, (said God,) and there was light. He spake the word, and it was done. Thus the heavens and the earth were created, and all the hosts of them." And this manner of acting in the present case, highly suits both his power and love. There is therefore no hindrance on God's part; since *as his Majesty is, so is his mercy.* And whatever hindrance there is on the part of man, when God speaketh, it is gone. Only *ask* then, O sinner, *and it shall be given thee*, even the faith that brings salvation: and that, without any merit or good work of thine; for, "it is not of works, lest any man should boast." No; it is of grace, of grace alone. For "unto him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness."

64. "But, by talking thus you encourage sinners;" I do encourage them—to repent: And do not you? Do not you know, how many heap sin upon sin, purely for want of such encouragement! Because they think "they can never be forgiven; there is no place for repentance left?" Does not your heart also bleed for them? What would you think too dear to part with? What would you not do? What would you not suffer, to bring one such sinner to repentance? Could not your love endure all things for them? "Yes—if I believed it would do them good; if I had any hope they would ever be better." Why do you not believe it would do them good? Why have you not a hope that they will be better? Plainly, because you do not love them enough: because you have not that charity, which not only endureth, but at the same time, believeth and hopeth all things.

65. But that you may see the whole strength of this objection, I will shew you without any disguise or reserve, how I encourage the very chief of sinners, my usual language to them runs thus:

O ye that deny the Lord that bought you, yet hear the word of the Lord. You seek rest, but find none. Even in laughter your heart is in heaviness. How long spend ye your labour for that which is not bread, and your strength for that which satisfieth not? You know your soul is not satisfied. It is still an aching void. Sometimes you find (in spite of your principles) a sense of guilt, an awakened conscience. That grisly phantom, religion, (so you describe her,) will now and then haunt you still. Righteousness looking down from heaven, is indeed to us no unpleasing sight. But how does it appear to you.

Horribili super aspectu mortalibus astans?

How often are you in fear of the very things you deny! How often in racking suspense! "What if there be an hereafter! A judgment to come! An unhappy eternity!" Do you not start at the thonghts? Can you be content to be always thus? Shall it be said of you also,

"Here lies a Dicer long in doubt
If death could kill the soul, or not?
Here ends his doubtfulness; at last
Convinc'd. But, O the die is cast!"

Or, are you already convinced, there is no hereafter? What a poor state then are you in now? Taking a few more dull turns upon earth, and then dropping into nothing! What kind of spirit must you be of, if you can sustain yourself under the thought! Under the expectation of being in a few months swept away by the stream of time, and then for ever

"Swallow'd up and lost,
In the wide womb of uncreated night!"

But neither indeed are you certain of this; nor of any thing else. "It may be so; it may not. A vast scene is behind. But clouds and darkness rest upon it." All is doubt and uncertainty. You are continually tossed to and fro, and have no firm ground for the sole of your foot. O let not the poor wisdom of man any longer exalt itself against the wisdom of God. You have fled from him long enough: at length suffer your eyes to be opened by him that made

them. You want rest to your soul. Ask it of him, "who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not!" You are now a mere riddle to yourself, and your condition full of darkness and perplexity. You are one among many restless inhabitants, of a miserable, disordered world, "walking in a vain shadow and disquieting yourself in vain." But the light of God will speedily disperse the anxiety of your vain conjectures. By adding heaven to earth, and eternity to time; it will open such a glorious view of things, as will lead you, even in the present world, to a peace which passeth all understanding.

66. O ye gross, vile, scandalous sinners, hear ye the word of the Lord. "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of a sinner, but rather that he should turn and live." O make haste; delay not the time. "Come, and let us reason together. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow; though they be red as crimson, they shall be as wool."—"Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments, red in his apparel?" It is he on whom the Lord "hath laid the iniquities of us all!" Behold, behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away thy sins! See the only begotten Son of the Father, *full of grace and truth!* He loveth *thee.* He gave himself for *thee.* Now, his bowels of compassion yearn over *thee!* O believe in the Lord Jesus, and *thou* shalt be saved! *Go in peace, sin no more!*

67. Now cannot *you* join in all this? Is it not the very language of your heart? O when will you take knowledge, that *our* whole concern, our constant labour is, to bring all the world to the religion which you feel, to solid, inward, vital religion! What *power* is it, then, that keeps us asunder? "Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart? If it be, give me thy hand. Come with me and see," and rejoice in *my zeal for the* Lord. No difference between us (if thou art a child of God) can be so considerable as our agreement is. If we differ in smaller things, we agree in that which is greatest of all. How is it possible, then, that

you should be induced, to think or speak evil of us? How could it ever come into your mind, to oppose us or weaken our hands? How long shall we complain of the wounds which we receive in the house of our friends? Surely the children of this world are still "wiser in their generation than the children of light." Satan is not divided against himself: why are they, who are on the Lord's side? How is it that *wisdom is* not *justified of her* own *children?*

68. Is it because you have heard, "That we only make religion a cloak for covetousness? And because you have heard abundance of particulars alleged in support of that general charge?" It is probable you may also have heard, "How much we have gained by preaching already!" and, to crown all, "That we are only Papists in disguise, who are undermining and destroying the Church!"

69. "You have heard this." Well: and can you believe it? Have you, then, never heard the 5th chapter of St. Matthew? I would to God you could believe this! What is written there? How readest thou? Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute yau, and say all manner of evil against you falsely for my name's sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets that were before you;"—namely, by reviling them, and *saying all manner of evil* of them *falsely*. Do not you know that this (as well as all other scriptures) must needs be fulfilled? If so, take knowledge, that this day also it is fulfilled in your ears. For our Lord's sake, and for the sake of his gospel which we preach, *men do revile us and persecute us*, and (blessed be God who giveth us to rejoice therein) *say all manner of evil of us falsely*. And how can it be otherwise? "The disciple is not above his Master. It is enough for the disciple, if he be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord. If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household!"

70. This only we confess, that, "we preach *inward* salvation, *now* attainable by faith." And *for preaching this*, (for *no other crime* was *then* so much as pretended,) we were

forbid to preach any more in any of those churches, where, till then, we were gladly received. This is a notorious fact. Being thus hindered from preaching in the places we should first have chosen, we now declare the "grace of God, which bringeth salvation," in all places of his dominion: as well knowing that God "dwelleth not in temples made with hands." This is the real, and it is the only real ground of complaint against us. And this we avow before all mankind, we do preach this salvation by faith. And not being suffered to preach it in the usual places, we declare it wherever a door is opened, either on a mountain or a plain, or by a river side, (for all which we conceive we have sufficient precedent,) or in a prison, or, as it were, in the house of Justus, or the school of one Tyrannus. Nor dare we refrain. A dispensation of the gospel is committed to me; and "woe is me, if I preach not the gospel."

71. Here we allow the fact, but deny the guilt. But in every other point alleged, we deny the fact, and call upon the world to prove it, if they can. More especially we call upon those who, for many years saw our manner of life at Oxford. These well know that after the most straitest sect of our religion, we lived Pharisees: and that the grand objection to us for all those years, was the being righteous overmuch: the reading, fasting, praying, denying ourselves; the going to church, to the Lord's table; the relieving the poor, visiting those that were sick and in prison; instructing the ignorant, labouring to reclaim the wicked—more than was necessary for salvation. These were our open, flagrant crimes, from the year 1729 to the year 1737; touching which our Lord shall judge in that day.

72. But waving the things that are past: which of you now convinceth us of sin? Which of you (I here more especially appeal to my brethren the clergy) can personally convict us of any ungodliness or unholiness of conversation? Ye know in your own hearts (all that are candid men, all that are not utterly blinded with prejudice) that we "labour to have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man." Brethren, I would to God that in this ye were even

as we. But indeed (with grief I speak it) ye are not. There are among yourselves ungodly and unholy men; openly, undeniably such: drunkards, gluttons, returners of evil for evil, liars, swearers, profaners of the day of the Lord. Proof hereof is not wanting, if ye require it. Where then is your zeal against these? A clergyman so drunk he can scarcely stand or speak, may, in the presence of a thousand people, * set upon another clergyman of the same church, both with abusive words and open violence. And what follows? Why, the one is still allowed to dispense the sacred signs of the body and blood of Christ. But the other is not allowed to receive them.—Because he is a field preacher!

73. O ye pillars and fathers of the church, are these things well-pleasing to him, who hath made you overseers over that flock which he hath purchased with his own blood? O that ye would suffer me to boast myself a little! Is there not a cause? Have not ye compelled me? Which of your clergy are more unspotted in their lives, which more unwearied in their labours, than those whose "names ye cast out as evil," whom ye count "as the filth and offscouring of the world?" Which of them is more zealous *to spend and to be spent*, for the lost sheep of the house of Isael? Or who amongst them is more ready to "be offered up for their flock upon the sacrifice and service of their faith?"

74. Will ye say, (as the historian of Cataline) *Si sic pro patria!* If this were done in defence of the church, and not in order to undermine and destroy it! That is the very proposition I undertake to prove. That "we are now defending the church, even the Church of England, in opposition to all those who either secretly undermine, or more openly attempt to destroy it?"

75. That we are Papists, (we, who are daily and hourly preaching that very doctrine, which is solemnly anathematized by the whole Church of Rome) is such a charge,

* At Epworth, in Lincolnshire.

that I dare not waste my time in industriously confuting it. Let any man of common sense only look on the title pages of the sermons we have lately preached at Oxford, and he will need nothing more to shew him the weight of this senseless, shameless accusation; unless he can suppose the governors both of Christ-church and Lincoln-college, nay, and all the University to be *Papists* too.

76. You yourself can easily acquit us of this: but not of the other part of the charge. You still think we are secretly undermining, if not openly destroying, the church. What do you mean by the church? A visible church (as our Article defines it) is, *A company of faithful (or believing) people: cœtus credentium.* This is the essence of a church: and the properties thereof are (as they are described in the words that follow) "That the pure word of God be preached therein, and the sacraments duly administered." Now, then, (according to this authentic account) what is *The Church of England?* What is it indeed, but the *faithful people*, the *true believers of England?* It is true, if these are scattered abroad, they come under another consideration. But when they are visibly joined, by assembling together to hear the pure Word of God preached, and to eat of one bread, and drink of one cup, they are then properly the visible Church of England.

77. It were well if this were a little more considered by those, who so vehemently cry out, *The Church! the Church!* (as those of old, *The Temple of the Lord! the Temple of the Lord!*) not knowing what they speak, nor whereof they affirm. A provincial or national church, according to our Article, is the true believers of that province or nation. If these are dispersed up and down, they are only a part of the invisible church of Christ. But if they are visibly joined by assembling together to hear his word and partake of his supper, they are then a visible church, such as the Church of England, France, or any other.

78. This being premised, I ask, How do we undermine or destroy the church? The provincial, visible Church of

England? The Article mentions three things as essential to a visible church: 1st, Living faith, without which indeed there can be no church at all, neither visible nor invisible; 2dly, Preaching (and consequently hearing) the pure Word of God, else the faith would languish and die; and, 3dly, A due administration of the sacraments, the ordinary means whereby God increaseth faith. Now come close to the question; in which of these points do we undermine, or destroy the Church? Do we shut the door of faith? Do we lessen the number of believing people in England? Only remember what faith is, according to our homilies, (viz. "A sure trust and confidence in God that, through the merits of Christ, my sins are forgiven, and I reconciled to the favour of God.") And we appeal to all mankind, Do we destroy this faith, which is the life and soul of the Church? Is there, in fact, less of this faith in England, than there was before we went forth? I think this is an assertion which the father of lies himself will scarce dare to utter or maintain.

With regard then to this first point, it is undeniable, we neither undermine nor destroy the Church. The second thing is, the preaching and hearing the pure word of God. And do we hinder this? Do we hinder any minister from preaching the pure word of God? If any preach not at all, or not the pure word of God, is the hindrance in us or in themselves? Or, do we lessen the number of those that hear the pure word of God? Are, then, the hearers thereof (whether read or preached) *fewer* than they were in times past? Are the usual places of public worship *less frequented* by means of our preaching? Wheresoever our lot has been cast for any time, are the churches *emptier* than they were before? Surely, none that has any regard left either for truth or modesty, will say, that *in this point* we are enemies to, or destroyers of, the Church.

The third thing requisite (if not to the *being*, at least) to the *well-being* of a church, is the due administration of the Sacraments, particularly that of the Lord's-supper. And

are we, in *this* respect, underminers or destroyers of the church? Do we either by our example or advice, draw men away from the Lord's-table? Where we have laboured most, are there the fewest communicants? How does the fact stand in London, Bristol, Newcastle? O that you would no longer shut your eyes against the broad light which encompasses you on every side!

79. I believe you are sensible by this time, not only how weak this objection is, but likewise how easy it would be, terribly to retort every branch of it upon most of those that make it: whether we speak of *true* living faith, of preaching the *pure* word of God, or of the *due* administration of the sacraments, both of baptism and the Lord's-supper. But I spare you. It sufficeth that our God knoweth, and will make manifest in that day, whether it be by reason of *us* or *you*, that *men abhor the offering of the* Lord.

80. Others object, "That we do not observe *the laws of the Church*, and thereby undermine it." What laws? The rubricks or canons? In every parish where I have been curate yet, I have observed the rubricks with a scrupulous exactness, not for wrath, but for conscience' sake. And this, so far as belongs to an unbeneficed minister, or to a private member of the church, I do now. I will just mention a few of them, and leave you to consider, which of us has observed or does observe them most.

1. Days of fasting or abstinence to be observed:—The forty days of Lent; the Ember days at the four seasons; the three Rogation days; all Fridays in the Year, except Christmas-Day.

2. "So many as intend to be partakers of the holy communion, shall signify their names to the curate, at least some time the day before: and if any of these be an open and notorious evil liver, the curate shall advertise him, that in any wise he presume not to come to the Lord's-table until he hath openly declared himself to have truly repented.

3. "Then (after the *Nicene* creed) the curate shall de-

clare unto the people, what holidays or fasting-days, are in the week following to be observed.

4. "The minister shall first receive the communion of both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the bishops, priests, and deacons, in like manner, if any be present, and after that, to the people.

5. "In cathedral and collegiate churches, and colleges, where there are many priests and deacons, they shall all receive the communion with the priest, every Sunday at the least.

6. "The children to be baptized, must be ready at the font, immediately after the last lesson.

7. "The curates of every parish shall warn the people, that without great necessity, they procure not their children to be baptized at home in their houses.

8. "The curate of every parish shall diligently upon Sundays and holidays, after the second Lesson at evening prayer, openly in the Church, instruct and examine so many children as he shall think convenient, in some part of the catechism.

9. "Whensoever the bishop shall give notice for children to be brought unto him for their confirmation, the curate of every parish shall either bring or send in writing, with his hand subscribed thereunto, the names of all such persons within his parish as he shall think fit to be presented to the bishop."

81. Now, the question is not, whether these rubricks ought to be observed, (you take this for granted in making the objection) but whether in fact they have been observed by you or me, most? Many can witness I have observed them punctually, yea, sometimes at the hazard of my life: and as many, I fear, that you have not observed them at all, and that several of them you never pretended to observe. And is it you that are accusing me, for not observing the rubricks of the church? What grimace is this! "O tell it not in Gath! Publish it not in the streets of Askelon!"

82. With regard to the canons, I would, in the first place, desire you to consider, two or three plain questions.

1st. Have you ever read them over? 2dly, How can these be called, "The canons of the Church of England?" Seeing they were never legally established by the Church? Never regularly confirmed in any full convocation? 3dly, By what right am I required to observe such canons as were never legally established? And then I will join issue with you on one question more, viz. Whether you or I have observed them most? To instance only in a few.

Can. 29. No person shall be admitted godfather or godmother to any child, before the said person hath received the holy communion.

Can. 59. Every Parson, Vicar, or Curate, upon every Sunday and Holiday, before Evening Prayer, shall, for half an hour, or more, examine and instruct the youth and ignorant persons of his parish.

Can. 64. Every Parson, Vicar, or Curate, shall declare to the people every Sunday, whether there be any holidays or fasting-days, the week following.

Can. 68. No minister shall refuse or delay to christen any child that is brought to the Church to him upon Sundays or holidays to be christened, or to bury any corpse that is brought to the church or church-yard.

(N. B. Inability to pay fees does not alter the case.)

Can. 75. No ecclesiastical persons shall spend their time idly, by day or by night, playing at dice, cards, or tables.

Now, let the clergyman who has observed only these five canons for one year last past, and who has read over all the canons in his congregation; (as the King's ratification straitly enjoins him to do once every year) let him, I say, cast the first stone at us, for not observing the Canons (so called) of the Church of England.

83. "However, we cannot be," it is said, "friends to the Church, because we do not *obey the Governors of it*, and *submit ourselves* (as at our ordination we promised to do) *to all their godly admonitions and injunctions.*" I answer, in every individual point of an indifferent nature, we do

and will (by the grace of God) obey the governors of the Church. But the *testifying* the *gospel of the grace of* God, is not a point of an indifferent nature. *The ministry which we have received of the* Lord Jesus, we are at all hazards to fulfil. It is *the burthen of the* Lord which is laid upon us here; and we are *to obey God rather than man.* Nor yet do we, in any ways, violate the promise which each of us made, when it was said unto him, "Take thou authority to preach the word of God, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." We then promised to *submit* (mark the words) *to the* godly *admonitions and injunctions of our ordinary.* But we did not, could not promise to obey *such* injunctions, as we know *are contrary to the word of* God.

84. "But why then," say some, "do you leave the Church?" *Leave the Church!* What can you mean? Do we leave so much as the *Church walls?* Your own eyes tell you, we do not. Do we leave the *ordinances of the Church?* You daily see and know the contrary. Do we leave the *fundamental doctrine of the Church,* namely, Salvation by Faith? It is our constant theme, in public, in private, in writing, in conversation. Do we leave the *practice of the Church,* the standard whereof are the ten commandments? Which are so essentially in-wrought in her constitution, (as little as you may apprehend it) that whosoever breaks one of the least of these, is no member of the Church of England. I believe you do not care to put the cause on this issue. Neither do you mean this, by *leaving the Church.* In truth, I cannot conceive what you mean. I doubt you cannot conceive yourself. You have retailed a sentence from somebody else, which you no more understand than he. And no marvel; for it is a true observation,

"Nonsense is never to be understood."

85. Nearly related to this is that other objection, that we *divide the Church.* Remember the Church is, *The faithful people,* or true believers. Now how do we *divide these?* "Why, by our societies." Very good. Now the case is plain.

"We *divide* them," you say, "by *uniting them together*." Truly, a very uncommon way of *dividing!* "O, but we divide those who are thus united with each other, from the rest of the Church." By no means. Many of them were before *joined to all their brethren* of the Church of England (and many were not, until they knew us) by *assembling themselves together*, to hear the word of God, and to eat of one bread, and drink of one cup. And do they now *forsake that assembling* themselves together? You cannot, you dare not say it. You know they are more diligent therein than ever: it being one of the fixed rules of our societies, "That every member attend the ordinances of God," i. e. *that he do not divide from the Church*. And if any member of the Church do thus divide from or leave it, he hath no more place among us.

86. I have considered this objection the more at large, because it is of most weight with sincere minds. And to all these, if they have fairly and impartially weighed the answer as well as the objection, I believe it clearly appears, that we are neither *undermining* nor *destroying*, neither *dividing* nor *leaving* the Church. So far from it, that we have great heaviness, on her account, yea, continual sorrow in our hearts. And our prayer to God is, that he would repair the breaches of Sion, and build the walls of Jerusalem, that this our desolate church may flourish again, and be the praise of the whole earth.

87. But perhaps you have heard, that "we in truth regard no church at all: that gain is the true spring of all our actions: that I, in particular, am well paid for my work, having thirteen hundred pounds a year (as a Reverend Author accurately computed it) at the Foundery alone, over and above what I receive from Bristol, Kingswood, Newcastle, and other places: and that whosoever survives me, will see I have made good use of my time; for I shall not die a beggar."

88. I freely own, this is one of the best advised objections which has ever yet been made; because it not only puts us upon proving a negative, (which is seldom an easy task) but

also one of such a kind as scarcely admits of any demonstrative proof at all. But for such proof as the nature of the thing allows, I appeal to my manner of life which hath been from the beginning. Ye who have seen it (and not with a friendly eye) for these twelve or fourteen years last past, or for any part of that time, Have ye ever seen any thing like the love of gain therein? Did I not continually remember the words of the Lord Jesus, *It is more blessed to give than to receive?* Ye of Oxford, Do ye not know these things are so? What gain did I seek among you? Of whom did I take any thing? From whom did I covet silver, or gold, or apparel? To whom did I deny any thing which I had even to the hour that I departed from you?—Ye of Epworth and Wroote, among whom I ministered for (nearly) the space of three years, what gain did I seek among you? Or of whom did I take or covet any thing?—Ye of Savannah and Frederica, among whom God afterwards proved me, and shewed me what was in my heart, what gain did I seek among you? Of whom did I take any thing? Or whose food or apparel did I covet (for silver or gold had ye none, no more than I myself for many months) even when I was in hunger and nakedness? Ye yourselves, and the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, know that I lie not.

89. "But," it is said, "things are fairly altered now. Now I cannot complain of wanting any thing; having the yearly income of a bishop of London, over and above what I gain at other places." At what other places, my friend? Inform yourself a little better, and you will find, that both at Newcastle, Bristol, and Kingswood, (the only places beside London, where any collection at all is made) the money collected is both received and expended by the stewards of those several societies, and never comes into my hands at all, neither first nor last. And you, or any who desire it, shall read over the accounts kept by any of those stewards, and see with your own eyes, that by all these societies, I gain just as much as you do.

90. The case in London stands thus. In November [illegible], two gentlemen, then unknown to me (Mr. Ball and

Mr. Watkins) came and desired me once and again, to preach in a place called the Foundry near Moorfields. With much reluctance I at length complied. I was soon after pressed to take that place into my own hands. These who were most earnest therein, lent me the purchase-money, which was 115*l.* Mr. Watkins and Mr. Ball then delivered me the names of several subscribers, who offered to pay, some four, or six, some ten shillings a year towards the re-payment of the purchase-money, and the putting the buildings into repair. This amounted one year to near 200*l.* the second to about 140*l.* and so the last.

91. The United Society begun a little after, whose weekly contribution (chiefly for the poor) is received and expended by the stewards, and comes not into my hands at all. But there is also a quarterly subscription of many of the society, which is nearly equal to that above mentioned.

92. The uses to which these subscriptions have been hitherto applied, are, 1st, the payment of that 115*l.*; 2dly, The repairing (I might almost say rebuilding) that vast, uncouth heap of ruins at the Foundry; 3dly, The building galleries both for men and women; 4thly, The enlarging the society room to near thrice its first extent. All taxes and occasional expenses are likewise defrayed out of this fund. And it has been hitherto so far from yielding any overplus, that it has never sufficed for these purposes yet. So far from it, that I am still in debt on these accounts, near 300*l.* So much have I hitherto gained by preaching the gospel! Besides a debt of 150*l.* still remaining on account of the schools built at Bristol; and another of above 200*l.* on account of that new building at Newcastle. I desire any reasonable man would now sit down and lay these things together, and let him see, whether, allowing me a grain of common sense, (if not of common honesty) he can possibly conceive, that a view of *gain* would induce me to act in this manner.

93. You can never reconcile it with any degree of common sense, that a man who wants nothing, who has already all the necessaries, all the conveniences, nay, and

of the superfluities of life, and these not only independent of any one, but less liable to contingencies than even a gentleman's freehold estate;—that such an one should calmly and deliberately throw up his ease, most of his friends; his reputation, and that way of life which of all others is most agreeable both to his natural temper and education: that he should toil day and night, spend all his time and strength, knowingly destroy a firm constitution, and hasten into weakness, pain, diseases, death, —— to gain a debt of six or seven hundred pounds!

94. But supposing the balance on the other side, let me ask you one plain question. For what gain (setting conscience aside) will you be obliged to act thus? To live exactly as I do? For what price will you preach (and that with all your might, not in an *easy, indolent, fashionable* way) eighteen or nineteen times every week? And this throughout the year? What shall I give you, to travel seven or eight hundred miles, in all weathers, every two or three months? For what salary will you abstain from all other diversions, than the doing good, and the praising God? I am mistaken if you would not prefer strangling to such a life, even with thousands of gold and silver.]

95. And what is the comfort you have found out for me in these circumstances? Why, that "I shall not die a beggar." So now I am supposed to be heaping up riches, "that I may leave them behind me." Leave them behind me! For whom? My wife and children? Who are they? They are yet unborn. Unless you mean the children of faith whom God hath given me. But my heavenly Father feedeth them. Indeed if I lay up riches at all, it must be *to leave them behind me;* seeing my fellowship is a provision for life. But I cannot understand this. What comfort would it be to my soul, now launched into eternity, that I had *left behind me* gold as the dust, and silver as the sand of the sea? Will it follow me over the great gulf? Or can I go back to it? Thou, that liftest up thy eyes in hell, what do thy riches profit thee now? Will all thou hadst under the sun, gain thee a drop of water to cool

thy tongue? O the comfort of *riches* left *behind*, to one who is tormented in that flame!—You put me in mind of those celebrated lines (which I once exceedingly admired) addressed by way of consolation to the soul of a poor self-murderer:

"Yet shall thy grave with rising flowers be drest,
And the green turf lie light upon thy breast!
Here shall the year its earliest beauties show;
Here the first roses of the Spring shall blow:
While angels, with their silver wings o'ershade
The place, now sacred by thy relicks made."

96. I will now simply tell you my sense of these matters, whether you will hear, or whether you will forbear. Food and raiment I have; such food as I choose to eat, and such raiment as I choose to put on. I have a place where to lay my head. I have what is needful for life and godliness. And I apprehend this is all the world can afford. The kings of the earth can give me no more. For, as to gold and silver, I count it dung and dross: I trample it under my feet. I (yet not I, but by the grace of God that is in me) esteem it just as mire in the streets. I desire it not; I seek it not: I only fear, lest any of it should cleave to me, and I should not be able to shake it off, before my spirit returns to God. It must indeed pass through my hands; but I will take care (God being my helper) that the mammon of unrighteousness shall only pass through; it shall not rest there. None of the accursed thing shall be found in my tents, when the Lord calleth me hence. And hear ye this, all you who have discovered the treasures which I am to leave behind me: if I leave behind me ten pounds (above my debts, and the little arrears of my fellowship) you and all mankind bear witness against me, that I lived and died a thief and a robber.

97. Before I conclude, I cannot but intreat you who know God, to review the whole matter from the foundation. Call to mind what the state of religion was, in our nation, a few years since. In whom did you find the *holy tempers*

that were in Christ? Bowels of mercies, lowliness, meekness, gentleness, contempt of the world, patience, temperance, long-suffering? A burning love to God, rejoicing evermore, and in every thing giving thanks; and a tender love to all mankind, covering, believing, hoping, enduring all things? Perhaps you did not know one such man in the world. But how many, that had *all unholy tempers!* What vanity and pride, what stubbornness and self-will, what anger, fretfulness, discontent, what suspicion and resentment, what inordinate affections, what irregular passions, what foolish and hurtful desires might you find, in those who were called *the best* of men! In those who made the strictest profession of religion! And how few did you know who went so far as the *profession* of religion, who had even the *form of godliness!* Did you not frequently bewail, wherever your lot was cast, the general want of even *outward religion!* How few were seen at the public worship of God! How much fewer at the Lord's-table? And was even this little flock zealous of good works, careful, as they had time, to do good to all men? On the other hand, did you not with grief observe, *outward irreligion* in every place? Where could you be for one week, without being an eye or an ear witness, of cursing, swearing, or profaneness, of sabbath-breaking or drunkenness, of quarrelling or brawling, of revenge or obscenity? Were these things done in a corner? Did not gross iniquity of all kinds overspread our land as a flood? Yea, and daily increase, in spite of all the opposition which the children of God did or could make against it?

98. If you had been then told, that the jealous God would soon arise and maintain his own cause; that he would pour down his Spirit from on high, and renew the face of the earth; that he would shed abroad his love in the hearts of the outcasts of men, producing all holy and heavenly tempers, expelling anger, and pride, and evil desire, and all unholy and earthly tempers; causing outward religion, the work of faith, the patience of hope, the labour of love, to flourish and abound; and wherever it spread, abolishing

outward irreligion, destroying all the works of the devil: if you had been told, that this living knowledge of the Lord would, in a short space, overspread our land; yea, and daily increase, in spite of all the opposition which the devil and his children did or could make against it: Would you not vehemently have desired to see that day, that you might bless God and rejoice therein?

99. Behold the day of the Lord is come. He is again visiting and redeeming his people. Having eyes, see ye not? Having ears, do ye not hear? Neither understand with your hearts? At this hour the Lord is rolling away our reproach. Already his standard is set up. His Spirit is poured forth on the outcasts of men, and his love shed abroad in their hearts. Love of all mankind, meekness, gentleness, humbleness of mind, holy and heavenly affections, do take place of hate, anger, pride, revenge, and vile or vain affections. Hence, wherever the power of the Lord spreads, springs outward religion in all its forms. The houses of God are filled; the table of the Lord is thronged on every side. And those who thus shew their love of God, shew they love their neighbour also, by being careful to maintain good works, by doing all manner of good (as they have time) to all men. They are likewise careful to abstain from all evil. Cursing, sabbath-breaking, drunkenness, with all other (however fashionable) works of the devil, are not once named among them. All this is plain, demonstrable fact. For this also is not done in a corner. Now, do you acknowledge the day of our visitation? Do you bless God and rejoice therein?

100. What hinders? Is it this, that men say all manner of evil of those whom God is pleased to use as instruments in his work? O ye fools, did ye suppose the devil was dead? Or that he would not fight for his kingdom? And what weapons shall he fight with if not with lies? Is he not a liar, and the father of lies? Suffer ye then thus far. Let the devil and his children say all manner of evil of us. And let them go on deceiving each other, and being deceived. But ye need not be deceived also. Or if you are, if you

will believe all they say; be it so, that we are weak, silly, wicked men; without sense, without learning, without even a desire or design of doing good: yet I insist upon the fact. Christ is preached, and sinners are converted to God. This none but a madman can deny. We are ready to prove it by a cloud of witnesses. Neither, therefore, can the inference be denied, that God is now visiting his people. O that all men may know in this their day, the things that make for their peace!

101. Upon the whole, to men of the world I would still recommend the known advice of Gamaliel: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone: for if this work be of men, it will come to nought: but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." But unto you whom God hath chosen out of the world, I say ye are our brethren, and of our Father's house, it behoveth you, in whatsoever manner ye are able, *to strengthen our hands in God.* And this ye are all able to do; to wish us good luck in the name of the Lord, and to pray continually, that none of *these things may move us*, and that "we may not count our lives dear unto ourselves, so that we may finish our course with joy, and the ministry which we have received of the Lord Jesus!"

A

FARTHER APPEAL

TO MEN OF

REASON AND RELIGION.

Let the Righteous smite me friendly and reprove me. Psa. cxli. 5.

PART I.

IN a former Treatise I declared, in the plainest manner I could, both my Principles and Practice; and answered some of the most important, as well as the most common objections to each. But I have not yet delivered my own soul. I believe it is still incumbent upon me to answer other objections, particularly such as have been urged by those who are esteemed religious or reasonable men.

These partly relate to the Doctrines I teach, partly to my manner of teaching them, and partly to the effects which are supposed to follow from teaching these doctrines in this manner.

I. 1. I will briefly mention what those doctrines are, before I consider the objections against them. Now all I teach respects either the nature and condition of Justification, the nature and condition of Salvation, the nature of justifying and saving Faith, or the Author of Faith and Salvation.

2. First, The nature of Justification. It sometimes means * our acquittal at the last day. But this is altogether out of the present question: that Justification whereof our

* *Matt.* xii. 37.

Articles and Homilies speak, meaning present forgiveness, pardon of sins, and consequently acceptance with God: who therein * *declares his righteousness* or mercy, by or *for the remission of the sins that are past*, saying, *I will be merciful to thy unrighteousness, and thine iniquities I will remember no more.*

I believe, † the condition of this, is Faith: I mean, not only, that without Faith we cannot be justified; but also, that as soon as any one has true Faith, in that moment he is justified.

§ Good works follow this faith, but cannot go before it: much less can sanctification, which implies, a continued course of good works, springing from holiness of heart. But it is allowed, that entire ‖ sanctification goes before our justification at the last day.

It is allowed also, that ‡ Repentance, and ¶ fruits meet for repentance, go before faith. Repentance absolutely must go before faith: fruits meet for it, if there be opportunity. By repentance, I mean conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment: and by *fruits meet for repentance*,- ** forgiving our brother, †† ceasing from evil, doing good, ‖‖ using the ordinances of God, and in general ‡‡ obeying him according to the measure of grace which we have received. But these, I cannot as yet, term *good works;* because they do not spring from faith and the love of God.

3. By salvation I mean, not barely, according to the vulgar notion, deliverance from hell, or going to heaven: but a present deliverance from sin, a restoration of the soul to its primitive health, its original purity: a recovery of the divine nature; the renewal of our souls after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness, in justice, mercy, and truth. This implies all holy and heavenly tempers, and by consequence all holiness of conversation.

* *Rom.* iii. 25. † *Rom.* iv. 5, &c. § *Luke* vi. 43. ‖ *Heb.* xii. 14. ‡ *Mark* i. 15. ¶ *Matt.* iii. 8. ** *Matt.* vi. 14, 15. †† *Luke* iii. 4, 9, &c. ‖‖ *Matt.* vii. 7. ‡‡ *Matt.* xxv. 29.

Now, if by salvation we mean a present salvation from sin, we cannot say, holiness is the condition of it. For it is the thing itself. Salvation, in this sense, and holiness, are synonymous terms. We must therefore say, "We are saved by faith." Faith is the sole condition of this salvation. For without faith we cannot be thus saved. But whosoever believeth, is saved already.

Without faith we cannot be thus saved. For we cannot rightly serve God, unless we love him. And we cannot love him, unless we know him: neither can we know God, unless by faith. Therefore salvation by faith, is only in other words, the love of God by the knowledge of God: or, the recovery of the image of God, by a true, spiritual acquaintance with him.

4. Faith, in general, is a divine, supernatural ελεγχος* of things not seen, not discoverable by our bodily senses, as being either past, future, or spiritual. Justifying faith implies, not only a divine ελεγχος, that God was in Christ "reconciling the world unto himself," but a sure trust and confidence that Christ died for my sins, that he loved me and gave himself for me. And the moment a penitent sinner believes this, God pardons and absolves him.

And as soon as his pardon or justification is witnessed to him by the Holy Ghost, he is saved. He loves God and all mankind. He has *the mind that was in* Christ, and power to *walk as he also walked*. From that time, unless he make shipwreck of the faith, salvation gradually increases in his soul. For "so is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground—And it springeth up, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear."

5. The first sowing of this seed, I cannot conceive to be other than instantaneous: whether I consider experience, or the word of God, or the very nature of the thing.—However, I contend not for a circumstance, but the substance; if you can attain it another way, do. Only see that you do attain it; for if you fall short, you perish everlastingly.

* *Evidence*, or *Conviction*.

This beginning of that vast, inward change, is usually termed, *The New Birth*. Baptism is the outward sign of this inward grace, which is supposed by our Church to be given with and through that sign to all infants, and to those of riper years, if they repent and believe the gospel. But how extremely idle are the common disputes on this head! I tell a sinner, "You must be born again." "No," say you, "he was born again in baptism: therefore he cannot be born again now." Alas! what trifling is this! What if he was then a child of God? He is now manifestly a child of the devil: for the works of his father he doth. Therefore, do not play upon words. He must go through an entire change of heart. In one not yet baptized, you yourself would call that change, The New Birth. In him, call it what you will; but remember mean time, that if either he or you die without it, your baptism will be so far from profiting you, that it will greatly increase your damnation.

6. The Author of faith and salvation is God alone. It is he that works in us both to will and to do. He is the sole giver of every good gift, and the sole author of every good work. There is no more of power than of merit in man; but as all merit is in the Son of God, in what he has done and suffered for us, so all power is in the Spirit of God. And therefore every man, in order to believe unto salvation, must receive the Holy Ghost. This is essentially necessary to every Christian, not in order to his working miracles, but in order to faith, peace, joy, and love, the ordinary fruits of the Spirit.

Although no man on earth can explain the *particular manner*, wherein the Spirit of God works on the soul, yet whosoever has these fruits, cannot but know and *feel* that God has wrought them in his heart.

Sometimes, he acts more particularly on the understanding, opening or *enlightening* it, (as the Scripture speaks) and *revealing*, unveiling, discovering to us *the deep things of God*.

Sometimes he acts on the wills and affections of men: withdrawing them from evil, inclining them to good, inspir-

ing (breathing, as it were) good thoughts into them: so it has frequently been expressed, by an easy, natural metaphor, strictly analogous to רוח, πνευμα, *Spiritus*, and the words used in most modern tongues also, to denote the Third Person in the Ever-blessed Trinity. But, however it be expressed, it is certain, all true faith, and the whole work of salvation, every good thought, word, and work, is altogether by the operation of the Spirit of God.

II. 1. I now come to consider the principal objections, which have lately been made against these doctrines.

I know nothing material which has been objected, as to the nature of Justification: but many persons seem to be very confused in their thoughts concerning it, and speak as if they had never heard of any justification antecedent to that of the last day. To clear up this, there needs only a closer inspection of our Articles and Homilies; wherein Justification is always taken, for the present remission of our sins.

But many are the objections which have been warmly urged, against the condition of Justification, Faith alone: particularly in two treatises, the former entitled, *The Notions of the Methodists* fully *disproved:* the second, *The Notions of the Methodists* farther *disproved.* In both of which it is vehemently affirmed, 1. That this is not a scriptural doctrine. 2. That it is not the doctrine of the Church of England.

It will not be needful to name the former of these any more; seeing there is neither one text produced therein, to prove this doctrine unscriptural, nor one sentence from the Articles or Homilies, to prove it contrary to the doctrine of the Church. But so much of the latter as relates to the merits of the *cause*, I will endeavour to consider calmly. As to what is *personal*, I leave it as it is. *God, be merciful to me a sinner!*

2. To prove this doctrine unscriptural, that "Faith alone is the condition of Justification," you allege, that "Sanctification, according to Scripture, must go before it:" to evince which, you quote the following texts, which I leave as I find them:* "Go, disciple all nations—teaching them

* Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded them." * "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." † "Preach repentance and remission of sins." ‡ "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins." ¶ "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." § "By one offering, he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." You add, "St. Paul taught ‖ 'Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;' and calls § 'Repentance from dead works, and faith toward God," *first principles.*

You subjoin, "But ye are washed," says he, "but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified." By *washed* is meant their baptism; and by their baptism is meant, first their sanctification, and then their justification." This is a flat begging the question; you take for granted, the very point which you ought to prove. "St. Peter also," you say, "affirms, that *baptism doth save us* or justify us." Again, you beg the question: you take for granted what I utterly deny, viz. that *save* and *justify* are here synonymous terms. Till this is proved, you can draw no inference at all; for you have no foundation whereon to build.

I conceive these and all the scriptures which can be quoted to prove Sanctification antecedent to Justification, if they do not relate to our final Justification, prove only, what I have never denied, that repentance, or conviction of sin, and fruits meet for repentance, precede that faith whereby we are justified: but by no means, that the love of God, or any branch of true holiness, must or can precede faith.

3. It is objected, secondly, That Justification by Faith alone, is not the doctrine of the Church of England.

"You believe," says the writer above-mentioned, that no good work can be previous to Justification, nor consequently a condition of it. But God be praised, our Church has no where delivered such abominable doctrine." Page 14.

"The clergy contend for inward holiness, as previous to

* Mark xvi. 16. † Luke xxiv. 47. ‡ Acts ii. 38. ¶ Chap. iii. 19. § Heb. x. 14. ‖ Acts xx. 21. § Heb. vi. 1.

the first justification.—This is the doctrine they universally inculcate, and which you cannot oppose without contradicting the doctrine of our Church." Page 26.

"All your strongest persuasives to the love of God, will not blanch over the deformity of that doctrine, that men may be justified—by faith alone—unless you publickly recant this horrid doctrine, your faith is vain." Page 27.

"If you will vouchsafe to purge out this venemous part of your principles, in which the *wide, essential, fundamental, irreconcilable difference*, as you very justly term it, mainly consists, then there will be found so far no disagreement between you and the Clergy of the Church of England." Ibid.

4. In order to be clearly and fully satisfied, what the doctrine of the Church of England is, as it stands opposed to the doctrine of the Antinomians, on the one hand, and to that of justification by works on the other, I will simply set down what occurs on this head, either in her Liturgy, Articles, or Homilies.

"Spare thou them, O God, which *confess their faults*: restore thou them that are *penitent*, according to thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesu, our Lord."

"He pardoneth and absolveth all them that *truly repent*, and *unfeignedly believe* his holy gospel."

"Almighty God, who dost forgive the sins of them that are *penitent*, create and make in us new and contrite hearts; that we *worthily lamenting our sins*, and *acknowledging our wretchedness*, may obtain of thee perfect remission and forgiveness, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Collect for Ash-Wednesday.

"Almighty God—hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with *hearty repentance and true faith*, turn unto him." Communion-Office.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ hath left power to absolve all sinners who *truly repent* and *believe* in him." Visitation of the Sick.

"Give him unfeigned *repentance* and steadfast *faith*, that his sins may be blotted out." Ibid.

"He is a merciful receiver of all true penitent sinners,

and is ready to pardon us, if we come unto him with faithful repentance." Commination Office.

Infants indeed, our Church supposes to be justified in baptism, although they cannot then either believe or repent, But she expressly requires both repentance and faith, in those who come to be baptized when they are of riper years.

As earnestly therefore as our Church inculcates, Justification by Faith alone, she nevertheless supposes repentance to be previous to faith, and *fruits meet for repentance:* yea, and universal holiness to be previous to final justification, as evidently appears from the following words:

"Let us beseech him—that the rest of our life may be pure and holy, so that at the last we may come to his eternal joy." Absolution.

"May we seriously apply our hearts to that holy and heavenly wisdom here, which may in the end bring us to life everlasting." Visitation of the Sick.

"Raise us from the death of sin unto the life of righteousness,—that at the last day we may be found acceptable in thy sight." Burial Office.

"If we from henceforth walk in his ways,—seeking always his glory, Christ will set us on his right hand." Commination Office.

5. We come next to the Articles of our Church: the former part of the ninth runs thus:

Of Original or Birth-Sin.

"Original sin—is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man—whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit: and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation."

ART. X. *Of Free-Will.*

"The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant

and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will."

ART. XI. *Of the Justification of Man.*

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."

I believe this Article relates to the *meritorious cause* of justification, rather than to the condition of it. On this therefore I do not build any thing concerning it, but on those that follow.

ART. XII. *Of Good Works.*

"Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins—yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith: insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree may be known by the fruit."

We are taught here, 1. That good works in general, follow after justification. 2. That they spring out of a true and lively faith, that faith whereby we are justified. 3. That true, justifying faith may be as evidently known by them, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

Does it not follow, That the supposing any good work to go before justification, is fully as absurd as the supposing an apple or any other fruit to grow before the tree?

But let us hear the Church, speaking yet more plainly.

ART. XIII. *Of Works done before Justification.*

"Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, (i. e. before justification, as the title expresses it,) are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ—yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not they have the nature of sin."

Now, if all works done before justification, have the nature of sin, (both because they spring not of faith in Christ, and because they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done,) what becomes of sanctification previous to justification? It is utterly excluded: seeing whatever is previous to justification, is not good or holy, but evil and sinful.

Although therefore our Church does frequently assert, that we ought to repent and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, if ever we would attain to that faith, whereby alone we are justified; yet she never asserts (and here the hinge of the question turns) that these are good works, so long as they are previous to justification. Nay, she expressly asserts the direct contrary, viz. That they have all the nature of sin. So that this "horrid, scandalous, wicked, abominable, venomous, blasphemous doctrine," is nevertheless the doctrine of the Church of England.

6. It remains, to consider what occurs in the Homilies, first with regard to the meritorious cause of our justification, agreeable to the 11th, and then with regard to the condition of it, agreeable to the 12th and 13th Articles.

"These things must go together in our justification; upon God's part, his great mercy and grace; upon Christ's part, the satisfaction of God's justice; and upon our part, true and lively faith in the merits of Jesus Christ." Homily on Salvation, part I. "So that the grace of God doth not shut out the justice (or righteousness) of God in our justification; but only shutteth out the righteousness of man—as to deserving our justification." "And therefore St. Paul declareth nothing on the behalf of man, concerning his justification, but only a true faith." "And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, to be joined with faith (that is, afterwards; see below) in every man that is justified—Neither doth faith shut out the righteousness of our good works, necessarily to be done afterwards. But it excludeth them so, that we may not do them to this intent, to be made just, (or, to be justified) by doing them." "That we are *justified by faith alone*, is spoken, to take away

clearly all *merit* of our works, and wholly to ascribe the *merit and deserving* of our justification unto Christ only." Ibid. Part II. "The true meaning of this saying, We be *justified by faith only*, is this, We be justified by the *merits* of Christ only, and not of our own works." Ibid. Part III.

7. Thus far touching the meritorious cause of our Justification; referred to in the 11th Article. The 12th and 13th are a summary of what now follows, with regard to the condition of it.

"Of (justifying) true faith, three things are specially to be noted, 1. That it bringeth forth good works. 2. That without it can no good works be done. 3. What good works it doth bring forth." *Sermon on Faith.* Part I.

"Without faith can no good work be done, acceptable and pleasant unto God. For as a branch cannot bear fruit of itself, saith our Saviour Christ, except it abide in the vine, so cannot you, except you abide in me. Faith giveth life to the soul; and they be as much dead to God that lack faith, as they be to the world, whose bodies lack souls. Without faith all that is done of us, is but dead before God. Even as a picture is but a dead representation of the thing itself, so be the works of all unfaithful (unbelieving) persons before God. They be but shadows of lively and good things, and not good things indeed. For true faith doth give life to the works, and without faith no work is good before God." Ibid. Part III.

"We must set no good works before faith, nor think that before faith a man may do any good works. For such works are as the course of a horse that runneth out of the way, which taketh great labour, but to no purpose." Ibid. "Without faith we have no virtues, but only the shadows of them. All the life of them that lack the true faith is sin." Ibid. "As men first have life, and after be nourished, so must our faith go before, and after be nourished with good works. And life may be without nourishment, but nourishment cannot be without life." Homily of Works annexed to Faith. Part I.

"I can shew a man, that by faith without works lived

and came to heaven. But without faith never man had life. The thief on the cross only believed, and the most merciful God justified him. Truth it is, if he had lived and not regarded faith and the works thereof, he should have lost his salvation again. But this I say, faith by itself saved him. But works by themselves never justified any man." "Good works go not before, in him which shall afterwards be justified. But good works do follow after, when a man is first justified." Homily on Fasting. Part I.

8. From the whole tenor, then, of her Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies, the doctrine of the Church of England appears to be this:

1. That no good work, properly so called, can go before Justification.

2. That no degree of true Sanctification can be previous to it.

3. That, as the *meritorious cause* of Justification is the life and death of Christ; so the condition of it is faith. Faith alone; and,

4. That both inward and outward holiness, are consequent on this faith, and are the ordinary, stated conditions of final Justification.

9. And what more can you desire, who have hitherto opposed *Justification by Faith alone*, merely upon a principle of conscience; because you were zealous for holiness and good works? Do I not effectually secure these from contempt, at the same time that I defend the doctrines of the Church? I not only allow, but vehemently contend, that none shall ever enter into glory, who is not holy on earth, as well in heart, as in all manner of conversation. I cry aloud, *Let all that have believed, be careful to maintain good works*; and, *Let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from all iniquity*. I exhort even those who are conscious they do not believe, *Cease to do evil, learn to do well; the kingdom of heaven is at hand*; therefore *repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance*. Are not these directions the very same in substance, which you yourself would give to persons so circumstanced? What means

then the endless *strife of words?* Or, *what doth your arguing prove?*

10. Many of those, who are perhaps as zealous of good works as you, think I have allowed you too much.—Nay, my brethren, how can we help allowing it, if we allow the Scriptures to be from God? For is it not written, and do not yourselves believe, *without holiness no man shall see the Lord?* And how then, without fighting about words, can we deny, that holiness is a condition of final acceptance? And, as to the first, acceptance or pardon, does not all experience as well as Scripture prove, that no man ever yet truly believed the gospel, who did not first repent? That none was ever yet truly convinced of righteousness, who was not first convinced of sin? Repentance therefore in this sense, we cannot deny to be necessarily previous to faith. Is it not equally undeniable, that the running back into known, wilful sin, (suppose it were drunkenness or uncleanness,) stifles that repentance or conviction? And can that repentance come to any good issue in his soul, who resolves not to forgive his brother? or who obstinately refrains from what God convinces him is right, whether it be prayer or hearing his word? Would you scruple yourself to tell one of these, "Why if you will thus drink away all conviction, how should you ever truly know your want of Christ? Or consequently, believe in him?—If you will not forgive your brother his trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you your trespasses—If you will not ask, how can you expect to receive?—If you will not hear, how can faith come by hearing?—It is plain, you grieve the Spirit of God; you will not have him to reign over you. For "unto him that hath, shall be given: but from him that hath not," i.e. uses it not, "shall be taken away even that which he hath." Would you scruple on a proper occasion to say this? You cannot scruple it, if you believe the Bible. But in saying this, you allow all which I have said, viz. That previous to justifying faith, there must be repentance, and, if opportunity permit, fruits meet for repentance.

11. And yet I allow you this, that although both repent-

ance and the fruits thereof are in some sense necessary before Justification, yet neither the one nor the other is necessary in the same sense or in the same degree with faith. Not in the same degree. For in whatever moment a man believes, (in the Christian sense of the word,) he is justified, his sins are blotted out, *his faith is counted to him for righteousness*. But it is not so, at whatever moment he repents, or brings forth any or all the fruits of repentance. Faith alone therefore justifies; which repentance alone does not; much less any outward work. And consequently, none of these are necessary to justification, in the same degree with faith.

Nor in the same sense. For none of these has so direct, immediate a relation to justification as faith. This is proximately necessary thereto: repentance, remotely, as it is necessary to the increase or continuance of faith. And even in this sense, these are only necessary, on supposition—if there be time and opportunity for them: for in many instances there is not: but God cuts short his work, and faith prevents the fruits of repentance. So that the general proposition is not overthrown, but clearly established by these concessions; and we conclude still, both on the authority of Scripture and the Church, that faith alone is the proximate condition of Justification.

III. 1. I was once inclined to believe that none would openly object, against what I have any where said of the *Nature of Salvation*. How greatly then was I surprised some months ago, when I was shewn a kind of Circular Letter, which one of those whom the Holy Ghost hath made overseers of his church, I was informed, had sent to all the clergy of his diocese! Part of it ran (nearly, if not exactly) thus: "There is great indiscretion in preaching up a sort of religion, as the true and only Christianity, which in their own account of it, consists in an enthusiastic ardor, to be understood or attained by very few, and not to be practised without breaking in upon the common duties of life." O my Lord, what manner of words are these? Supposing candor and love out of the question, are they words of

truth? I dare stake my life upon it, there is not one true clause in all this paragraph. The propositions contained therein, are these:—1. That the Religion I preach consists in an Enthusiastic Ardor: 2. That it can be attained by very few: 3. That it can be understood by very few: 4. That it cannot be practised without breaking in upon the common duties of life: 5. And that all this may be proved by my own account of it.

I earnestly intreat your Grace, to review my own account of it, as it stands in any of my former writings: or to consider the short account which is given in this. And if you can thence make good any one of those propositions, I do hereby promise before God and the world, that I will never preach more.

At present, I do not well understand what your Grace means by "An Enthusiastic Ardor." Surely you do not mean, the love of God! No, not though a poor, pardoned sinner should carry it so far, as to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his strength! But this alone is the Ardor which I preach up, as the foundation of the True and only Christianity. I pray God so to fill your whole heart therewith, that you may praise him for ever and ever. But why should your Grace believe, that the love of God, can be attained by very few? Or that it can be understood by very few? All who attain it, understand it well. And did not he, who is loving to every man, design, that every man should attain true love? O that all would know in this their day, the things that make for their peace! And cannot the love both of God and our neighbour be practised, without breaking in upon the common duties of life? Nay, can any of the common duties of life, be rightly practised without them? I apprehend, not. I apprehend I am then laying the true, the only foundation for all those duties, when I preach, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.*

2. With this Letter was sent (I believe to every Clergyman in the Diocese) the Pamphlet entitled, *Observations on*

the Conduct and Behaviour of a certain Sect, usually distinguished by the name of Methodists. It has been generally supposed to be written by a person, who is every way my superior. Perhaps one reason why he did not inscribe his name was, that his greatness might not make me afraid: and that I might have liberty to stand as it were, on even ground, while I answer for myself. In considering, therefore, such parts of these Observations, as naturally fall in my way, I will take that method which, I believe, that Author desires, using no ceremony at all; but speaking as to an Equal, that it may the more easily be discerned, where the truth lies.

The first Query relating to Doctrine, is this:

"Whether Notions in Religion may not be heightened to such extremes, as to lead some into a disregard of religion itself, through despair of attaining such exalted heights? And whether others who have imbibed those Notions, may not be led by them, into a disregard and disesteem of the common duties and offices of life? To such a degree, at least, as is inconsistent with that attention to them, and that diligence in them, which Providence has made necessary to the well-being of private families and public societies, and which Christianity does not only require in all stations, and in all conditions, but declares at the same time, that the performance even of the lowest offices in life, as unto God, (whose Providence has placed people in their several stations) is truly a serving of Christ, and will not fail of its reward in the next world?"

You have interwoven so many particulars in this general Question, that I must divide and answer them one by one.

Q. 1. Whether Notions in Religion may not be heightened to such extremes as to lead some into a disregard of Religion itself?

A. They may. But that I have so heightened them, lies upon you to prove.

Q. 2. Whether others may not be led into a disregard of Religion, through despair of attaining such exalted heights?

A. What heights? The loving God with all our heart? I believe, this is the most exalted height in man or angel. But I have not heard, that any have been led into a disregard of Religion, through despair of attaining this.

Q. 3. Whether others who have imbibed these Notions, may not be led by them into a disregard and disesteem, of the common duties and offices of life?

A. My Notions are, "True Religion is the loving God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves; and in that love abstaining from all evil, and doing all possible good to all men." Now, it is not possible in the nature of things, that any should be led by these Notions, into either a disregard or disesteem of the common duties and offices of life.

Q. 4. But may they not be led by them into such a degree at least, of disregard for the common duties of life, as is inconsistent with that attention to them, and diligence in them, which Providence has made necessary?

A. No. Quite the reverse. They lead men to discharge all those duties with the strictest diligence and closest attention.

Q. 5. Does not Christianity require this attention and diligence in all stations and in all conditions?

A. Yes.

Q. 6. Does it not declare, that the performance even of the lowest offices of life, as unto God, is truly a serving of Christ? And will not fail of its reward in the next world?

A. It does. But whom are you confuting? Not me. For this is the Doctrine I preach continually.

Query the second. "Whether the enemy of Christianity may not find his account, in carrying Christianity, which was designed for a rule to all stations, and all conditions, to such heights as make it fairly practicable by a very few, in comparison, or rather by none?"

I answer, 1. The height to which we carry Christianity (as was but now observed) is this, *thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.*

2. The Enemy of Christianity cannot find his account, in our carrying it to this height. 3. You will not say on reflection, that Christianity, even in this height, is practicable by very few, or rather by none: you yourself will confess, this is a rule (as God designed it should) for all stations, and all conditions.

Query the third. "Whether, in particular, the carrying the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone to such a height, as not to allow that a careful and sincere observance of moral duties is so much as a condition of our acceptance with God, and of our being justified in his sight: whether this, I say, does not naturally lead people to a disregard of those duties, and a low esteem of them; or rather to think them no part of the Christian Religion?"

I trust Justification by Faith alone, has been so explained above, as to secure, not only a high esteem, but also a careful and sincere observance of all moral duties.

Query the fourth. "Whether a due and regular attendance on the public offices of Religion, paid by good men in a serious and composed way, does not better answer the true ends of devotion, and is not a better evidence of the co-operation of the Holy Spirit, than those sudden agonies, roarings and screamings, tremblings, droppings down, ravings and madnesses, into which their hearers have been cast?"

I must answer this Query likewise, part by part.

Q. 1. Whether a due and regular attendance on the public offices of Religion, paid in a serious and composed way, by good (i. e. well-meaning) men, does not answer the true ends of Devotion?

A. I suppose by Devotion you mean public worship; by the true ends of it, the love of God and man: and by a due and regular attendance on the public offices of Religion, paid in a serious and composed way, the going as often as we have opportunity to our Parish Church, and to the Sacrament there administered.—If

so, the question is, "Whether this attendance on those offices, does not produce the love of God and man?" I answer, sometimes it does; and sometimes it does not. I myself thus attended them for many years; and yet am conscious to myself, that during that whole time, I had no more of the love of God than a stone. And I know many hundreds, perhaps thousands of serious persons, who are ready to testify the same thing.

Q. 2. But is not this a better evidence of the co-operation of the Holy Spirit, than those sudden agonies?

A. All these persons, as well as I, can testify also, that this is no evidence at all of the co-operation of the Holy Spirit. For some years I attended these public offices, because I would not be punished for non-attendance. And many of these attended them, because their parents did before them, or because they would not lose their character. Many more, because they confounded the means with the end, and fancied this *opus operatum* would bring them to heaven. How many thousands are now under this strong delusion! Beware, you bring not their blood on your own head!

Q. 3. However, does not this attendance better answer those ends, than those roarings, screamings, &c.?

I suppose you mean, "Better than an attendance on that preaching, which has often been accompanied with these." I answer. 1. There is no manner of need to set the one in opposition to the other: seeing we continually exhort all who attend on our preaching, to attend the offices of the Church. And they do pay a more regular attendance there, than ever they did before. 2. Their attending the Church did not, in fact, answer those ends at all, till they attended this preaching also. 3. It is the preaching remission of sins through Jesus Christ, which alone answers the true ends of Devotion. And this will always be accompanied with the co-operation of the Holy Spirit; though not always with sudden agonies, roarings, screamings, tremblings, or droppings down. Indeed if God is pleased at any time to permit any of these, I cannot hinder it. Neither can this

hinder the work of his Spirit in the soul: which may be carried on either with or without them. But, 4. I cannot apprehend it to be any reasonable proof, that "this is not the work of God," that a convinced sinner should fall into an extreme agony, both of body and soul, (Journal 3, 1 Edit: duod. p. 26.) That another should roar for the disquietness of her heart (p. 40) that others should scream or cry with a loud and bitter cry, "What must we do to be saved?" (p. 50.) that others should exceedingly tremble and quake. (p. 58.) And others, in a deep sense of the majesty of God, should fall prostrate upon the ground. (p. 59.) Indeed by picking out one single word from a sentence, and then putting together what you had gleaned in sixty or seventy pages, you have drawn a terrible groupe, for them who look no farther than those two lines in the Observations. But the bare addition of half a line to each word, just as it stands in the place from which you quoted it, reconciles all both to Scripture and Reason, and the spectre-form vanishes away.

You have taken into your account, ravings and madnesses too. As instances of the former, you refer to the case of *John Haydon*, (p. 44.) and of *Thomas Maxfield*, (p. 50.) I wish you would calmly consider, the reasoning of one on that head, who is not prejudiced in my favour. "What influence sudden and sharp awakenings may have upon the body, I pretend not to explain. But I make no question Satan, so far as he gets power, may exert himself on such occasions, partly to hinder the good work in the persons who are thus touched with the sharp arrows of conviction, and partly to disparage the work of God, as if it tended to lead people to distraction."

For instances of madness you may refer to page 88, 90, 91, 92, 93. The words in page 88, are these: "I could not but be under some concern, with regard to one or two persons, who were tormented in an unaccountable manner, and seemed to be indeed lunatic as well as sore-vexed.—Soon after I was sent for to one of these, who was so strangely torn of the devil, that I almost wondered her

relations did not say, Much religion *hath made thee mad.* We prayed God to *bruise Satan* under her feet. Immediately *we had the petition we asked of him.* She cried out vehemently, 'He is gone, he is gone,' and was filled with the spirit of *Love, and of a sound mind.* I have seen her many times since strong in the Lord. When I asked abruptly, 'What do you desire now?' She answered, 'Heaven.' I asked, 'What is in your heart?' She replied, 'God.' I asked, 'But how is your heart when any thing provokes you?' She said, 'By the grace of God, I am not provoked at any thing. All the things of this world pass by me as shadows.' Are these the words of one that is beside herself? Let any man of reason judge!

Your next instance, p. 60, stands thus:—"About noon I came to Usk, where I preached to a small company of poor people, on, *The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost.* One grey-headed man wept and trembled exceedingly: and another who was there (I have since heard) as well as two or three who were at the *Devauden, are gone quite distracted;* that is, (observe, the following are my express words, in which I immediately specify what it was which *some accounted distraction)* 'They mourn and refuse to be comforted, till they have *Redemption through his blood.*'"

If you think the case mentioned, p. 92, 93, to be another instance of madness, I contend not. It was because I did not understand that uncommon case, that I prefaced it with this reflection. "The fact I nakedly relate, and leave every man to his own judgment upon it." Only be pleased to observe, that this madness, if such it were, is no more chargeable upon me than upon you. For the subject of it had no relation to, connection or communication with me, nor had I ever seen her before that hour.

5. Query the fifth. "Whether those exalted strains in religion, and an imagination of being already in a state of perfection, are not apt to lead men to spiritual pride, and to a contempt of their fellow christians; while they consider them as only going on in what they call the *low* and *imper-*

fect way, (i. e. as growing in grace and goodness only by degrees) even though it appeared by the lives of those who are considered by them as in that low and imperfect way, that they are persons who are gradually working out their salvation, by their own honest endeavours, and through the ordinary assistance of God's grace; with an humble reliance upon the merits of Christ for the pardon of their sins, and the acceptance of their sincere, though imperfect services?"

I must divide this Query too, but first permit me to ask, what do you mean by those exalted strains in religion? I have said again and again, I know no more exalted strain, than "I will love thee, O Lord, my God:" especially according to the propriety of David's expression ארחמך יהוה, *Ex intimis visceribus diligam te, Domine, I will love thee, O Lord, from my inmost bowels or soul.* This premised, let us go on step by step.

Q. 1. Whether the preaching of "loving God from our inmost bowels," is not apt to lead men to spiritual pride, and to contempt of their fellow Christians?

A. No: But so far as it takes place, it will humble them to the dust.

Q. 2. Whether an imagination of being already in a state of perfection, is not apt to lead men into this spiritual pride?

A. 1. If it be a false imagination, it is spiritual pride. 2. But true Christian Perfection is no other than humble love.

Q. 3. Do not men who imagine they have attained this, despise others, as only going on in what they account the low and imperfect way, that is, as growing in grace and goodness by degrees?

A. 1. Men who only imagine they have attained this, may probably despise those that are going on in any way. 2. But the growing in grace and goodness by degrees, is no mark of a *low* and *imperfect* way. Those who are fathers in Christ, grow in grace, by degrees, as well as the new-born babes.

Q. 4. Do they not despise those who are working out their salvation, with an humble reliance upon the merits of Christ for the pardon of their sins, and the acceptance of their sincere though imperfect services?

A. 1. They who really love God, despise no man. But, 2. they grieve to hear many talk of thus relying on Christ, who though perhaps they are grave, honest, moral men, yet by their own words appear not to love God at all: whose souls cleave to the dust, who love the world; who have no part of the mind in them that was in Christ.

6. Query the sixth. "Whether the same exalted strains and notions, do not tend to weaken the natural and civil relations among men, by leading the inferiors into whose heads those notions are infused to a disesteem of their superiors; while they consider them as in a much lower dispensation than themselves; though those superiors are otherwise sober and good men, and regular attendants on the ordinances of Religion?"

I have mentioned before, what those exalted notions are: these do not tend to weaken either the natural or civil relations among men; or to lead inferiors to a disesteem of their superiors, even where those superiors are neither good nor sober men.

7. Query the seventh. "Whether a gradual improvement in grace and goodness is not a better foundation of comfort, and of an assurance of a gospel new-birth, than that which is founded on the doctrine of a sudden and instantaneous change; which, if there be any such thing, is not easily distinguished from fancy and imagination; the workings whereof we may well suppose to be more strong and powerful, while the person considers himself in the state of one who is admitted as a candidate for such a change, and is taught in due time to expect it?

Let us go one step at a time.

Q. 1. Whether a gradual improvement in grace and goodness is not a good foundation of comfort?

A. Doubtless it is, if by grace and goodness be meant the knowledge and love of God through Christ.

Q. 2. Whether it be not a good foundation of an assurance of a Gospel New-Birth?

A. If we daily grow in this knowledge and love, it is a good proof that we are born of the Spirit. But this does in nowise supersede the previous witness of God's Spirit with ours, that we are the children of God. And this is properly the foundation of the assurance of faith.

Q. 3. Whether this improvement is not a better foundation of comfort, and of an assurance of a Gospel New-Birth, than that which is founded on the doctrine of a sudden and instantaneous change?

A. A better foundation than that—That! What? To what substantive does this refer? According to the Rules of Grammar, (for all the other substantives are in the Genitive Case, and consequently to be considered as only parts of that which governs them) you must mean, "A better foundation than that foundation which is founded on this doctrine." As soon as I understand the question, I will endeavour to answer it.

Q. 4. Can that sudden and instantaneous change be easily distinguished from fancy and imagination?

A. Just as easily as light from darkness; seeing it brings with it a peace that passeth all understanding, a joy unspeakable and full of glory, the love of God and all mankind filling the heart, and power over all sin.

Q. 5. May we not well suppose the workings of imagination to be more strong and powerful in one who is taught to expect such a change?

A. Perhaps we may—But still the tree is known by its fruits. And such fruits as those above-mentioned, imagination was never yet strong enough to produce, nor any power, save that of the Almighty.

8. There is only one clause in the eighth Query, which under our present inquiry.

"They make it their principal employ, wherever they go, to instill into people a few *favourite tenets* of their own; and this with such diligence and zeal as if the whole of christianity depended upon them, and all efforts toward the

true christian life, without a belief of those tenets, were vain and ineffectual."

I plead guilty to this charge. I do make it my principal, nay, my whole employ, and that wherever I go, to instill into the people a few favourite tenets. (Only be it observed they are not my own, but his that sent me.) And it is undoubtedly true, that this I do, (though deeply conscious of my want, both of zeal and diligence) as if the whole of christianity depended upon them, and all efforts without them were void and vain. I frequently sum them all up in one, In Christ Jesus, (i. e. according to his gospel) "neither circumcision availeth any thing nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." But many times I instill them one by one, under these, or the like expressions, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength: thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; *as thy own soul, as Christ loved us.*" "God is Love: and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." "While we have time let us do good unto all men; especially unto them that are of the household of faith." "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do unto them." These are my favourite tenets, and have been for many years. O that I could instill them into every soul throughout the land! Ought they not to be instilled with such diligence and zeal, as if the whole of christianity depended upon them? For who can deny, that all efforts towards a Christian life, without more than a bare belief, without a thorough experience and practice of these, are utterly vain and ineffectual?

9. Part of your ninth Query is to the same effect:

"A few young heads set up their own Schemes, as the great standard of christianity: and indulge their own notions to such a degree, as to perplex, unhinge, terrify, and distract the minds of multitudes of people, who have lived from their infancy under a Gospel-Ministry, and in the

regular exercise of a Gospel-worship. And all this, by persuading them, that they neither are, nor can be true christians, but by adhering to their doctrines."

What do you mean by their own schemes? Their own notions? Their doctrines? Are they not yours too? Are they not the schemes, the notions, the doctrines of Jesus Christ? The great, fundamental truths of his gospel? Can you deny one of them, without denying the Bible?—It is hard for you to kick against the pricks!

"They persuade (you say) multitudes of people, that they cannot be true christians, but by adhering to their doctrines." Why, who says they can? Whosoever he be, I will prove him to be an infidel. Do you say, that any man can be a true christian, without loving God and his neighbour? Surely you have not so learned Christ! It is your doctrine, as well as mine, and St. Paul's, "Though I speak with the tongue of men and angels; though I have all knowledge, and all faith; though I give all my goods to feed the poor, yea, my body to be burned, and have not love, I am nothing." Whatever public worship, therefore, people may have attended, or whatever Ministry they have lived under from their infancy, they must at all hazards, be convinced of this, or they perish for ever: yea, though that conviction at first unhinge them ever so much; though it should, in a manner, distract them for a season. For it is better that they should be perplexed and terrified now, than they should sleep on and awake in hell.

10. In the 10, 12, and 13th Queries, I am not concerned. But you include me also, when you say in the 11th, "They absolutely deny, that recreations of any kind, considered as such, are or can be innocent."

I cannot find any such assertion of mine, either in the place you refer to, or any other. But what kinds of recreation are innocent, it is easy to determine by that plain rule, "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." I am now to take my leave of you for the present. But first I would earnestly intreat you to acquaint yourself what our doctrines are, before you make

any farther observations upon them. Surely, touching the nature of salvation we agree, that "pure religion and undefiled is this, to visit the fatherless and widow in their affliction," to do all possible good, from a principle of Love to God and man: and to keep ourselves unspotted from the world, inwardly and outwardly to abstain from all evil.

11. With regard to the condition of salvation, it may be remembered, that I allow, not only faith, but likewise holiness or universal obedience, to be the ordinary condition of final salvation: and that when I say, faith alone is the condition of present salvation, what I would assert is this: 1. That without faith no man can be saved from his sins, can be either inwardly or outwardly holy. And, 2. That at what time soever faith is given, holiness commences in the soul. For that instant, the love of God, (which is the source of holiness) is shed abroad in the heart.

But it is objected by the Author of *The Notions of the Methodists disproved*, St. James says, "Can faith save him?" I answer, Such a faith as is without works cannot bring a man to heaven. But this is quite beside the present question.

You object, 2. St. Paul says, "That faith is made perfect by love," St. James, "That faith made perfect by works, *is the condition of salvation.*" You mean final salvation. I say so too: but this also is beside the question.

You object, 3. "That the Belief of the Gospel," is called "the obedience of faith," Rom. i. 5. And, 4. That what Isaiah terms Believing, St. Paul terms Obeying. Suppose I grant you both the one and the other, what will you infer?

You object, 5. That in one scripture our Lord is stiled "The Saviour of them that believe:" and in another, "The Author of eternal salvation, to all them that obey him." 6. That to the Galatians St. Paul writes, "Neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love:" and to the Corinthians, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing,

but the keeping the commandments of God." And hence you conclude, "There are several texts of Scripture, wherein unbelief and disobedience are equivalently used." Very true: but can you conclude from thence, that we are not *saved by faith alone?*

12. You proceed to answer some texts which I had quoted. The first is Ephesians ii. 8, "By grace ye are saved through faith." "But (say you) faith does not mean here, that grace especially so called, but includes also obedience." But how do you prove this? That circumstance you had forgot: and so run off with a comment upon the context; to which I have no other objection, than that it is nothing at all to the question. Indeed, some time after, you add, "It is plain then that good works are always, in St. Paul's judgment, joined with faith." (So undoubtedly they are, that is, as an effect is always joined with its cause.) "And therefore we are not saved by faith alone." I cannot possibly allow the consequence. You afterwards cite two more texts, and add, "You see mere faith cannot be a condition of justification." You are out of your way. We are no more talking now of justification than of final salvation.

In considering Acts xvi. 31, "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved," you say again, "Here the word *believe* does not signify faith only.—Faith necessarily produces charity and repentance; therefore, these are expressed by the word *believe*." i.e. Faith necessarily produces holiness. Therefore holiness is a condition of holiness. I want farther proof. That Paul and Silas spake unto him the word of the Lord; and that his faith did in the same hour work by love, I take to be no proof at all.

You then undertake to shew, that confessing our sins is a condition of justification, and that a confidence in the love of God, is not a condition, some of your words are, "This, good Sir, give me leave to say, is the greatest nonsense and contradiction possible. It is impossible you can understand this jargon yourself, and therefore you labour in vain to make it intelligible to others. You soar aloft on eagles'

wings, and leave the poor people to gape and stare after you." This is very pretty and very lively. But it is nothing to the purpose. For we are not now speaking of justification: neither have I said one word of "The condition of justification" in the whole Tract to which you here refer.

"In the next place, (say you) if we are saved (finally you mean) only by a confidence in the love of God"—Here I must stop you again; you are now running beside the question, on the other hand. The sole position which I here advance is this: true believers are saved from inward and outward sin by faith. By faith alone, the love of God and all mankind is shed abroad in their hearts, bringing with it the mind that was in Christ, and producing all holiness of conversation.

IV. 1. I am now to consider, What has been lately objected, with regard to the nature of saving faith.

The author last mentioned "cannot understand how those texts of St. John are at all to the purpose." 1 John iii. 1, "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God." And chap. iv. 19, "We love him, because he first loved us." I answer, 1. These texts were not produced in the Appeal by way of proof, but of illustration only. But, 2. I apprehend they may be produced as a proof both that Christian faith implies a confidence in the love of God, and that such a confidence has a direct tendency to salvation, to holiness both of heart and life. "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God!" Are not these words an expression of Christian faith! As direct a one as can well be conceived? And I appeal to every man, whether they do not express the strongest confidence of the love of God? Your own comment puts this beyond dispute: "Let us consider attentively and with grateful hearts, the great love and mercy of God, in calling us to be his sons, and bestowing on us the privileges belonging to such." Do you not perceive, that you have given up the cause? You have yourself taught us, that these words imply, "A sense of the great love and mercy of God, in bestowing upon us the privileges belong-

ing to his sons." The Apostle adds, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." I suppose no one will say, either that these words are not expressive of Christian faith; or, that they do not imply the strongest confidence in the love of God. It follows, "And every man that hath this hope in him, purifieth himself even as he is pure." Hence it appears, That this faith is a saving faith, that there is the closest connexion between this faith and holiness. This text therefore is directly to the purpose, in respect of both the propositions to be proved.

The other is, "We love him because he first loved us." And here also, for fear I should fail in the proof, you have drawn it up ready to my hands. "God sent his only Son—to redeem us from sin, by purchasing for us grace and salvation. By which grace we—through faith and repentance have our sins pardoned—And therefore we are bound to return the tribute of our love and gratitude, and to obey him faithfully as long as we live." Now, though we have our sins pardoned, if we do not know they are pardoned, this cannot bind us either to love or obedience. But if we do know it, and by that very knowledge, or confidence in the pardoning love of God, are both bound and enabled to love and obey him, this is the whole of what I contend for.

2. You afterwards object against some other texts which I had cited, to illustrate the nature of saving faith. My words were, "Hear believing Job, declaring his faith, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth.' I here affirm two things, 1. That Job was then a believer. 2. That he declared his faith in these words. And all I affirm, you allow. Your own words are, 'God was pleased to bestow upon him a strong assurance of his favour—to inspire him with a prophecy of the resurrection, and that he should have a share in it.'"

I went on, "Hear Thomas, when having seen he believed, crying out, 'My Lord and my God.' Hereon you comment thus, 'The meaning of which is, that St. Thomas

makes a confession both of his faith and repentance.' I agree with you. But you add, 'In St. Thomas's confession there is not implied an assurance of pardon.' You cannot agree with yourself in this; but immediately subjoin, 'If it did imply such an assurance, he might well have it, since he had an immediate revelation of it from God himself.'"

Yet a little before you endeavoured to prove that one who was not a whit behind the very chief Apostles, had not such an assurance: where, in order to shew that faith does not imply this, you said, "St. Paul methinks has fully determined this point, (1 Cor. iv. 4,) 'I know nothing by myself,' says he, 'yet am I not hereby justified.'—And if an Apostle so illuminated, does not think himself justified."—Then I grant, he has fully determined the point. But before you absolutely fix upon that conclusion, be pleased to remember your own comment that follows, on those other words of St. Paul: "The life I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." Your words are, "And no question a person endowed with such extraordinary gifts, might arrive at a very eminent degree of assurance."—So he did arrive at a very eminent degree of assurance, though he did not think himself justified!

I can scarcely think you have read over that chapter to the Colossians: else surely you would not assert, that "those words on which the stress lies, (viz. *Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son, in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sin)* do not relate to Paul and Timothy who wrote the Epistle, but to the Colossians, to whom they wrote." I need be at no pains to answer this; for presently after your own words are, "He hath made us, meaning the Colossians, as well as himself, meet to be inheritors."—

3. You may easily observe, that I quoted the Council of Trent by memory, not having the book then by me. I own, and thank you for correcting my mistake: but in correcting one, you make another. For the decrees of the sixth session

were not "published on the 13th of January:" but the session itself began on that day.

I cannot help reciting your words, although they are not exactly to the present question.

"The words of the 12th Canon of the Council of Trent are, 'If any man shall say that justifying faith is nothing else, but a confidence in the Divine mercy, remitting sins for Christ's sake, and that this confidence is that alone by which we are justified, let him be accursed.' You add, "This, Sir, I am sure, is true doctrine, and perfectly agreeable to the doctrine of our Church. And so you are not only anathematized by the Council of Trent, but also condemned by our own Church. Our Church holds no such scandalous and disgraceful opinion."—According to our Church, no man can have "the true faith, who has not a loving heart."—"Therefore faith is not a confidence that any man's sins are actually forgiven, and he reconciled to God." What have the premises to do with the conclusion?

4. To decide this, let our Church speak for herself. Whether she does not suppose and teach, that every particular believer knows that his sins are forgiven, and that he himself is reconciled to God.

First then, Our Church supposes and teaches every particular believer, to say concerning himself, "In my baptism I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. And I thank God who hath called me to that state of salvation. And I pray God that I may continue in the same, to my life's end." Now does this person know what he says to be true? If not, it is the grossest hypocrisy. But if he does, then he in particular is reconciled to God.

The next words I shall quote may be a comment on these: may God write them in our hearts!

"A true Christian man is not afraid to die, who is the very member of Christ, the temple of the Holy Ghost, the son of God, and the very inheritor of the everlasting kingdom of heaven. But plainly contrary, he not only puts away the fear of death, but wishes, desires, and longs

heartily for it.' *Sermon against the Fear of Death.* Part I. Now can this be, unless he has a sure confidence that he, in particular, is reconciled to God? "Men commonly fear death, first because of leaving their worldly goods and pleasures. 2. For fear of the pains of death; and, 3. For fear of perpetual damnation. But none of these causes trouble good men, because they stay themselves by the true faith, perfect charity, and sure hope of endless joy and bliss everlasting." Ibid. Part II. All these therefore have great cause to be full of joy, and not to fear death nor everlasting damnation. For death cannot deprive them of Jesus Christ, death cannot take him from us, nor us from him. Death not only cannot harm us, but also shall profit us and join us to God more perfectly. And thereof a Christian heart may surely be certified. It is God, saith St. Paul, "which hath given us an earnest of his Spirit." As long as we be in the body, we are in a strange country. But we have a desire rather to be at home with God." Ibid. He that runneth may read in all these words, the confidence which our Church supposes every particular believer to have, that he himself is reconciled to God.

To proceed, "The only instrument of salvation required on our part is faith, that is, a sure trust and confidence, that God both hath and will forgive our sins, that he hath accepted us again into his favour, for the merits of Christ's death and passion." Second Sermon on the Passion. "But here, we must take heed that we do not halt with God, through an inconstant, wavering faith. Peter coming to Christ upon the water, because he fainted in faith was in danger of drowning. So we, if we begin to waver or doubt, it is to be feared lest we should sink as Peter did: not into the water, but into the bottomless pit of hell-fire. Therefore I say unto you, that we must apprehend the merits of Christ's death by faith, and that with a strong and steadfast faith: nothing doubting, but that Christ by his own oblation hath taken away our sins, and hath restored us again to God's favour." Ibid.

5. If it be still said, That the Church speaks only of men

in general, but not of the confidence of this or that particular person: even this last, poor subterfuge, is utterly cut off by the following words: "Thou, O man, hast received the body of Christ which was once broken, and his blood which was shed for the remission of thy sin. Thou hast received his body, to have within thee the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for to endow thee with grace, and to comfort thee with their presence. Thou hast received his body, to endow thee with everlasting righteousness, and to assure thee of everlasting bliss." Sermon on the Resurrection. I shall add but one passage more, from the first part of the Sermon on the Sacrament.

"Have a sure and constant faith, not only that the death of Christ is available for all the world, but that he hath made a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee, a perfect cleansing of thy sins, so that thou mayest say with the Apostle, he loved thee and gave himself for thee. For this is, to make Christ thine own, and to apply his merits unto thyself."

Let every reasonable man now judge for himself, which is the sense of our Church as to the nature of saving faith. Does it not abundantly appear, that the Church of England supposes every particular believer, to have a sure confidence, that his sins are forgiven, and he himself reconciled to God? Yea, and how can the absolute necessity of this faith, this unwavering confidence, be more strongly or peremptorily asserted, than it is in those words: "If we begin to waver or doubt, it is to be feared lest we sink as Peter did: not into the water; but into the bottomless pit of hell-fire?"

6. I would willingly dismiss this writer here. I had said in the Earnest Appeal (what I am daily more and more confirmed in) that this faith is usually given in a moment. This you greatly dislike. Your argument against it, if put into form, will run thus:

"They, who first apprehended the meaning of the words delivered, then gave their assent to them, then had confidence in the promises to which they assented, and lastly, loved God, did not receive faith in a moment." But the

believers mentioned in the Acts, first apprehended the meaning of the words, then gave their assent, then had confidence in the promises, and, lastly, loved God: therefore "The believers mentioned in the Acts did not receive faith in a moment."

I deny the major. They might first apprehend, then assent, then confide, then love, and yet receive faith in a moment: in that moment wherein their general confidence became particular, so that each could say, "My Lord, and my God."

One paragraph more I will be at the pains to transcribe. "You insinuate, that the sacraments are only requisite to the well-being of a visible church: whereas the Church declares, that the due administration of them, is an essential property thereof. I suppose you hinted this to gratify your loving disciples the Quakers." This is flat and plain. Here is a fact positively averred; and a reason also assigned for it. Now, do you take yourself to be a man of candor, I had almost said, of common honesty? My very words in the place referred to, are, "A visible church is a company of faithful people. This is the essence of it. And the properties thereof are, that the pure word of God be preached therein, and the sacraments duly administered."

7. Before I take my leave, I cannot but recommend to you that advice of a wise and good man,

> "Be calm in arguing; for fierceness makes
> Error a fault, and truth discourtesy."

I am grieved at your extreme warmth: you are in a thorough ill-humour from the very beginning of your book to the end. This cannot hurt me: but it may yourself. And it does not at all help your cause. If you denounce against me all the curses from Genesis to the Revelation, they will not amount to one argument. I am willing (so far as I know myself) to be reproved either by you or any other. But whatever you do, let it be done in love, in patience, in meekness of wisdom.

V. 1. With regard to the Author of Faith and Salvation, abundance of objections have been made: it being a cur-

rent opinion, that "Christians are not now to receive the Holy Ghost."

Accordingly, whenever we speak of the Spirit of God, of his operations in the souls of men, of his revealing unto us the things of God, or inspiring us with good desires or tempers; whenever we mention the feeling his mighty power, working in us, according to his good pleasure: the general answer we have to expect is, "This is all rank enthusiasm. So it was with the Apostles and first Christians. But only enthusiasts pretend to this now." Thus all the scriptures, abundance of which might be produced, are set aside at one stroke. And whoever cites them, as belonging to all Christians, is set down for an enthusiast.

The first Tract I have seen written expressly on this head, is remarkably entitled, "The Operations of the Holy Spirit imperceptible, and how men may know, when they are under the guidance and influence of the Spirit."

You begin, "As we have some among us who pretend to a more than ordinary guidance by the Spirit—[indeed I do not: I pretend to no other guidance, than is ordinarily given to all Christians] it may not be improper to discourse, on the operations of God's Holy Spirit.—To this end, be thou pleased, O gracious Fountain of Truth, to assist me with thy heavenly direction in speaking of thee."

Alas, Sir, what need have you to speak any more? You have already granted all I desire, viz. That "we may all now enjoy, and know that we do enjoy, the heavenly direction of God's Spirit." However, you go on, and observe that the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, were granted to the first Christians only, but his ordinary graces to all Christians in all ages: both which you then attempt to enumerate: only suspending your discourse a little, when "some conceited enthusiasts" come in your way.

2. You next inquire, "After what manner these graces are raised in our souls?" And answer, "How to distinguish these heavenly motions, from the natural operations of our minds, we have no light to discover: the Scriptures—declaring that the operations of the Holy Spirit, are not sub-

ject to any sensible feelings or perceptions. For what communication can there be between feelings which are properties peculiar to matter, and the suggestion of the Spirit? ——All reasonable Christians believe, that he works his graces in us in an imperceptible manner; and that there is no sensible difference between his and the natural operations of our minds."

I conceive this to be the strength of your cause. To support that conclusion, that the operations of the Spirit are imperceptible, you here allege, 1. "That all reasonable Christians believe this." So you say. But I want proof. 2. "That there can be no communications (I fear, you mistook the word) between the suggestions of the Spirit, and feelings which are properties peculiar to matter." How! Are the feelings now in question, properties peculiar to matter? The feeling of peace, joy, love? Or any feelings at all? I can no more understand the philosophy than the divinity of this. 3. "That the Scriptures declare, the operations of the Spirit are not subject to any sensible feelings." You are here disproving, as you suppose, a proposition of mine. But are you sure you understand it? By feeling, I mean, being inwardly conscious of. By the operations of the Spirit, I do not mean the manner in which he operates, but the graces which he operates in a Christian. Now be pleased to produce those Scriptures which declare, "That a Christian cannot feel or perceive these operations."

3. Are you not convinced, Sir, that you have laid to my charge things which I know not? I do not gravely tell you, as much an enthusiast as you over and over affirm me to be, "That I sensibly feel, in your sense, the motions of the Holy Spirit." Much less do I "make this, any more than convulsions, agonies, howlings, roarings, and violent contorsions of the body," either "Certain signs of men's being in a state of salvation," or "necessary in order thereunto." You might with equal justice and truth inform the world, and the Worshipful the Magistrates of Newcastle, that I make seeing the wind or feeling the light necessary to salvation. Neither do I "confound the extraordinary with the ordinary

operations of the Spirit." And as to your last inquiry, "What is the best proof of our being led by the Spirit?" I have no exception to that just and scriptural answer, which you yourself have given, "A thorough change and renovation of mind and heart, and the leading a new and holy life."

4. "That I confound the extraordinary with the ordinary operations of the Spirit, and therefore am an enthusiast," is also strongly urged in a Charge delivered to his Clergy, and lately published by the Lord Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry. An extract of the former part of this I subjoin in his Lordship's words. "I cannot think it improper to obviate the contagion of those enthusiastical pretensions, that have lately betrayed whole multitudes, either into presumption or melancholy. Enthusiasm indeed, when detected, is apt to create infidelity: and infidelity is so shocking a thing, that many rather run into the other extreme, and take refuge in enthusiasm. But infidelity and enthusiasm seem now to act in concert against our established religion. As infidelity has been sufficiently opposed, I shall now lay before you the weakness of those enthusiastical pretensions." Page 1, 2.

Now to confute effectually, and strike at the root of those enthusiastical pretensions; "First, I shall shew, that it is necessary to lay down some method for distinguishing real from pretended inspiration." Page 3, 5. "Many expressions occur in the New Testament concerning the operations of the Holy Spirit. But men of an enthusiastical temper, have confounded passages of a quite different nature, and have jumbled together those that relate to the extraordinary operations of the Spirit, with those that relate to his ordinary influences. It is therefore necessary to use some method for separating those passages, relating to the operations of the Spirit, that have been so misapplied to the service of enthusiastical pretenders." Page 5, 6, 7.

"I proceed therefore to shew, Secondly, That a distinction is to be made between those passages of Scripture about the blessed Spirit, that peculiarly belong the primi-

tive church, and those that relate to Christians in all ages." Page 7. "The exigencies of the apostolic age required the miraculous gifts of the Spirit. But these soon ceased. When therefore we meet in the Scripture with an account of those extraordinary gifts, and likewise with an account of his ordinary operations, we must distinguish the one from the other, and that not only for our own satisfaction, but as a means to stop the growth of enthusiasm." Page 8, 9, 10. "And such a distinction ought to be made, by the best methods of interpreting the Scriptures: which most certainly are an attentive consideration of the occasion and scope of those passages, in concurrence with the general sense of the primitive church." P. 11.

"I propose, thirdly, to specify some of the chief passages of Scripture that are misapplied by modern enthusiasts, and to shew that they are to be interpreted chiefly, if not only, of the apostolical church; and that they very little, if at all, relate to the present state of Christians." P. 12.

"I begin," says your Lordship, "with the original promise of the Spirit, as made by our Lord a little before he left the world." I must take the liberty to stop your Lordship on the threshold. I deny that this is the original promise of the Spirit. I expect his assistance, in virtue of many promises, some hundreds of years prior to this. If you say, "However, this is the original or first promise of the Spirit, in the New Testament;" I answer, No, my Lord; those words were spoken long before: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Will you reply, "Well, but this is the original promise made by our Lord?" I answer, not so neither. For it was before this, Jesus himself stood and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink: he that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. And this he spake of the Spirit, which they should receive who believed on him," (ὃ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς αὐτόν.) If I mistake not, this may more justly be termed our Lord's original promise of the Spirit. And who

will assert, that this, "is to be interpreted chiefly, if not only of the apostolical Church?"

5. Your Lordship proceeds: "It occurs in the 14th and 16th chapters of St. John's Gospel; in which he uses these words."—In what verses, my Lord? * Why is not this specified? Unless to furnish your Lordship with an opportunity of doing the very thing whereof you before complained, of "confounding passages of a quite contrary nature, and jumbling together those that relate to the extraordinary operations of the Spirit, with those that relate to his ordinary influences?"

You cite the words thus: "When the Spirit of Truth is come he will guide you into all Truth, and he will shew you things to come." (These are nearly the words that occur, chap. xvi. ver. 13.) And again, "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." (These words occur in the 14th chapter, at the 26th verse.)

But, my Lord, I want the original promise still; the original (I mean) of those made in this very discourse. Indeed your margin tells us, where it is, (chap. xiv. ver. 16;) but the words appear not. Taken together with the context they run thus:---"If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever: Even the Spirit of Truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him." Chap. xiv. ver. 15, 16, 17. My Lord, suffer me to inquire, why you slipped over this text? Was it not, I appeal to the Searcher of your heart, because you were conscious to yourself, that it would necessarily drive you to that unhappy dilemma, either to assert that for ever, εις τον αιωνα, meant only sixty or seventy years; or to allow that the text must be interpreted of the ordinary operations

* I take it for granted, that the citation of texts in the margin, which is totally wrong, is a blunder of the Printer's.

of the Spirit, in all future ages of the Church? And indeed that the promise in this text belongs to all Christians, evidently appears, not only from your Lordship's own concession, and from the text itself, for who can deny, that this Comforter, or Paraclete, is now given to all them that believe? but also from the preceding, as well as following, words. The preceding are, "If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father"---None surely can doubt, but these belong to all Christians in all ages. The following words are, "Even the Spirit of Truth, whom the *world* cannot receive." True; the *world* cannot; but all Christians can, and will receive him for ever.

6. The second promise of the Comforter, made in this chapter, together with its context stands thus:---"Judas saith unto him, (not Iscariot) Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" ver. 22. "Jesus answered and said unto him, if any man love me, he will keep my word. And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him," ver. 23. "He that loveth me not, keepeth not my word: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me," ver. 24. "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet with you," ver 25. "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," ver. 26.

Now, how does your Lordship prove that this promise belongs only to the Primitive Church? Why, 1. You say, "It is very clear from the bare recital of the words." I apprehend not. But this is the very question, which is not to be begged, but proved. 2. You say, "'The Spirit's bringing all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them,' cannot possibly be applied to any other persons but the Apostles." "Cannot be applied!" This is a flat begging the question again, which I cannot give up without better reasons. 3. "The gifts of prophecy, and

of being *guided into all truth, and taught all things*, can only be applied to the Apostles, and those of that age who were immediately inspired." Here your Lordship, in order the more plausibly to beg the question again, "jumbles together the extraordinary with the ordinary operations of the Spirit." The gift of prophecy, we know, is one of his extraordinary operations; but there is not a word of it in this text: nor, therefore, ought it to be "confounded with his ordinary operations," such as the being guided into all truth, (all that is necessary to salvation) and taught all (necessary) things, in a due use of the means he hath ordained. ver. 26.

In the same manner, namely, in a serious and constant use of proper means, I believe the assistance of the Holy Ghost is given to all Christians, to bring all things needful to their remembrance, whatsoever Christ hath spoken to them in his word. So that I see no occasion to grant, without some kind of proof, (especially considering the occasion of this, and the scope of the preceding verses) that even "this promise cannot possibly be applied to any other persons but the Apostles."

7. In the same Discourse of our Lord we have a third promise of the Comforter. The whole clause runs thus:

"If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him unto you." Chap. xvi. ver. 7---13. "And when he is come, he will reprove (or *convince*) the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. Of sin, because they believe not on me: Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more: Of judgment, because the Prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you: but ye cannot bear them now: But when he shall come, the Spirit of Truth, he will guide you into all truth ---and he will shew you things to come."

There is only one sentence here which has not already been considered, "He will shew you things to come." And this, it is granted, relates to the gift of prophecy, one of the extraordinary operations of the Spirit.

The general conclusion which your Lordship draws, is expressed in these words. "Consequently all pretensions to the Spirit, in the proper sense of the words of this promise (i. e.) of these several texts of St. John) are vain and insignificant, as they are claimed by modern Enthusiasts." And in the end of the same paragraph you add, "None but the ordinary operations of the Spirit are to be now expected, since those that are of a miraculous (or extraordinary) kind are not pretended to, even by modern Enthusiasts."

My Lord, this is surprising. I read it over and over, before I could credit my own eyes. I verily believe this one clause, with unprejudiced persons, will be an answer to the whole book. You have been vehemently crying out all along against those Enthusiastical Pretenders; nay, the very design of your book, as you openly declare, was "to stop the growth of their enthusiasm, who have had assurance, (as you positively affirm, page 6,) to claim to themselves the extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit." And here you as positively affirm, that those extraordinary operations "are not pretended to by them at all!"

8. Yet your Lordship proceeds, "The next passage of Scripture I shall mention as peculiarly belonging to the primitive times, though misapplied to the present state of Christians by modern enthusiasts, is what relates to the testimony of the Spirit, and praying by the Spirit, in the 8th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans." Page 16.

I believe it incumbent upon me thoroughly to weigh the force of your Lordship's reasoning on this head. You begin, "After St. Paul had treated of that spiritual principle in Christians, which enables them to mortify the deeds of the body—he says, 'if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.' This makes the distinction of a true Christian, particularly in opposition to the Jews." I apprehend it is just here, that your Lordship turns out of the way, when you say, "Particularly in opposition to the Jews." Such a particular opposition I cannot allow, till some stronger proof is produced, than St. Paul's occasionally

mentioning six verses before, "the imperfection of the Jewish law."

Yet your Lordship's mind is so full of this, that after repeating the 14th and 15th verses ("as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God: for ye have not received the Spirit of Bondage again to fear: but ye have received the Spirit of Adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father!") you add, "In the former part of this verse, the Apostle shews again the imperfection of the Jewish law." This also calls for proof: otherwise it will not be allowed, that he here speaks of the Jewish law at all; not, though we grant that "the Jews were subject to the fear of death, and lived, in consequence of it, in a state of bondage." For are not all Unbelievers, as well as the Jews, more or less, in the same fear and bondage?

Your Lordship goes on, "In the latter part of the verse he shews the superiority of the Christian law to that of the Jews." Page 18. Where is the proof, my Lord? How does it appear, that he is speaking either of the Christian or Jewish law, in those words, "Ye have received the Spirit of Adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father?" However, you infer, "Christians then are the adopted Sons of God, in contradistinction to the Jews, as the former had the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which none of the latter had at that time: and the body of the Jews never had." No, nor the body of the Christians neither. So that if this be a proof against the Jews, it is the very same against the Christians.

I must observe farther on the preceding words, 1. That your Lordship begins here, to take the word *Christians* in a new and peculiar sense, for the whole body of the then Christian Church: 2. That it is a bad inference, "as, or because they had the gifts of the Holy Ghost, therefore they were the Sons of God." On the one hand, if they were the children of God, it was not, because they had those gifts. On the other, a man may have all those gifts, and yet be a child of the devil.

9. I conceive not only that your Lordship has proved nothing hitherto, not one point that has any relation to the

question; but that, strictly speaking, you have not attempted to prove any thing, having taken for granted whatever came in your way. In the same manner you proceed, "The Apostle goes on, 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God.' This passage, as it is connected with the preceding one, relates to the general adoption of Christians, or their becoming the sons of God instead of the Jews."---"This passage relates"---How is that proved? By its connexion with the preceding? In no wise, unless it be good arguing to prove *ignotum per ignotius*. It has not yet been proved, that the preceding passage itself has any relation to this matter.

Your Lordship adds, "But what was the ground of this preference that was given to Christians? It was plainly the (miraculous) gifts of the Spirit, which they had, and which the Jews had not." This preference given to Christians, was just before expressed by their becoming the sons of God instead of the Jews. Were the gifts of the Spirit then the ground of this preference? The ground of their becoming the Sons of God? What an assertion is this! And how little is it mended, though I allow, that "these miraculous gifts of the Spirit, were a testimony that God acknowledged the Christians to be his people and not the Jews; (since the christians who worked miracles, did it not by the works of the law, but by the hearing of faith?")

Your Lordship concludes, "From these passages of St. Paul compared together, it clearly follows, that the forementioned testimony of the Spirit, was the public testimony of miraculous gifts—and, consequently, the witness of the Spirit that we are the children of God, cannot possibly be applied, to the private testimony of the Spirit given to our own consciences, as is pretended by modern Enthusiasts." Page 20.

If your conclusion, my Lord, will stand without the premises it may: but that it has no manner of connection with them, I trust it does partly, and will more fully appear, when we view the whole passage to which you refer. And I believe that passage, with very little comment, will

prove, in direct opposition to that conclusion, that the testimony of the Spirit there mentioned, is not the public testimony of miraculous gifts, but must be applied to the private testimony of the Spirit, given to our own consciences.

10. St. Paul begins the eighth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, with the great privilege of every christian believer, (whether Jew or Gentile before,) *There is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus*, engrafted into him by faith, *who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.* For now every one of them may truly say, "The law (or power) of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus (given unto me for his sake) hath made me free from the law (or power) of sin and death. For that which the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin," did; when he condemned, (crucified, put to death, destroyed) sin in the flesh: "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit. For they that are after the flesh, mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit," Verse 1---5.

Is it not evident, that the Apostle is here describing a true christian, a holy believer? In opposition, not particularly to a Jew, much less to the Jewish law; but to every unholy man, to all, whether Jews or Gentiles, who walk after the flesh? He goes on,

"For, to be carnally-minded is death; but to be spiritually-minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God; neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh, cannot please God." Verse 6, 7, 8.

The opposition between a holy and unholy man, is still glaring and undeniable. But can any man discern the least glimmering of opposition, between the Christian and the Jewish law?

The Apostle goes on, "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.

Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. But if Christ be in you, the body is dead, because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit which dwelleth in you. Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God," Verse 9 --14. Is there one word here, is there any the least intimation of miraculous gifts, or of the Jewish law? It follows, "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again, to fear, (such as all sinners have, when they are first stirred up to seek God, and begin to serve him from a slavish fear of punishment;) but ye have received the Spirit of adoption (of free love) whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself (which God hath sent forth into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father,) beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Verse 15, 16.

I am now willing to leave it, without farther comment, to the judgment of every impartial reader, whether it does not appear from the whole scope and tenor of the text and context taken together, that this passage does not refer to the Jewish law, and to the public testimony of miracles: neither of which can be dragged in, without putting the utmost force on the natural meaning of the words. And if so, it will follow, that this witness of the Spirit is the private testimony given to our own consciences; which, consequently, all sober Christians may claim, without any danger of enthusiasm.

11. "But I go on" (says your Lordship, page 21,) "to the consideration of the other passages in the same chapter, relating to our praying by the Spirit, namely at verse 26 and 27, which run thus, 'Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for

us, with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints, according to the will of God.' "

Here is a circumstance highly needful to be observed, before we enter upon this question. Your Lordship undertakes to fix the meaning of an expression used by St. Paul, in the fourteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians. And in order thereto, you laboriously explain part of the eighth chapter to the Romans. My Lord, how is this? Will it be said, "Why this is often alleged to prove the wrong sense of that scripture?" I conceive this will not salve the matter at all. Your Lordship had before laid down a particular method, as the only sure one whereby to distinguish what scriptures belong to all christians, and what do not. This method is, the considering the occasion and scope of those passages, by comparing the text and context together. You then propose, by the use of this method, to shew, that several texts have been misapplied by Enthusiasts. One of these is the 15th verse of the 14th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians. And to shew, that Enthusiasts have misapplied this, you comment on the eighth chapter to the Romans!

However, let us weigh the comment itself. The material part of it begins thus: (p. 22.) "Now he adds another proof of the truth of Christianity: likewise the Spirit helpeth our infirmities (or our distresses, for ἀσθενειαις signifies both." I doubt that: I require authority for it.) "And then he mentions, in what instances he does so, viz. In prayers to God about afflictions—" (In nothing else, my Lord? Did he help their infirmities, in no other instance than this?) "We know not, says he, what we should pray for as we ought. That is, whether it be best for us to bear afflictions, or to be delivered from them. But the Spirit, or the gift of the Spirit, instructs us how to pray in a manner agreeable to the will of God." The Spirit, or the gift of the Spirit! What marvellous reasoning is this! If these

"are often put for each other," what then? How is that evinced to be the case here?

12. "The Apostle goes on, *The Spirit itself* (p. 23,) *maketh intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered:* that is, the spiritual or inspired person prayed in that capacity for the whole assembly." "That is!" Nay, that is again the very point to be proved, else we get not one step farther. "The Apostle goes on thus, verse 27, *And he that* (p. 24,) *searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit* (that is, of the spiritual or inspired person) *because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the Will of God.* That is, God knows the intention of the spiritual person, who has the gift of prayer, which he uses for the benefit of the whole assembly; he, I say, leaves it entirely to God, whether it be best that they should suffer afflictions, or be delivered from them." Page 25.

My Lord, this is more astonishing than all the rest! I was expecting all along in reading the preceding pages (and so I suppose, was every thinking reader) when your Lordship would mention, that the person miraculously inspired for that intent, and praying κατα Θεον either for the support or deliverance of the people, should have the very petition which he asked of him. Whereas you intended no such thing! But shut up the whole with that lame and impotent conclusion, "He leaves it to God, whether it be best they should suffer afflictions, or be delivered from them." Had he then that miraculous gift of God, that he might do what any common christian might have done without it? Why, any person in the congregation might have prayed thus: nay, could not pray otherwise, if he had the ordinary grace of God: "Leaving it to God, whether he should suffer afflictions still, or be delivered from them!" Was it only in the Apostolical age, that "the Spirit instructed christians thus to pray?" Cannot a man pray thus, either for himself or others, unless he have the miraculous gift of prayer?---So, according to your Lordship's judgment, "To pray in such a manner as in the event to leave the continuance of our sufferings, or our deliverance from them, with

a due submission, to the good pleasure of God," is one of those "extraordinary operations of the Spirit," which none now pretend to but "modern Enthusiasts!"

I beseech your Lordship to consider. Can you coolly maintain, that "the praying with a due submission to the Will of God," even in heavy affliction is a miraculous gift? An extraordinary operation of the Holy Ghost? Is this peculiar to the primitive times? Is it what none but Enthusiasts now pretend to? If not, then your Lordship's own account of praying by the Spirit indisputably proves, that this is one of the ordinary privileges of all christians, to the end of the world.

13. "I go on (your Lordship adds) to another passage of Scripture, that has been entirely (p. 27,) misapplied by modern Enthusiasts. 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5, 'And my speech and my preaching were not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God.' (p. 29.) It is only necessary to evince, that by the demonstration of the Spirit and of power is meant the demonstration of the truth of Christianity, that arises from the prophecies of the Old Testament and the miracles of Christ and his Apostles." Yes, it is necessary farther to evince, that these words have no other meaning. But, first, How will you evince, that they bear this? In order thereto, your Lordship argues thus:

"The former seems to be the demonstration of the Spirit, with regard to the prophetical testimonies of him.---And the demonstration of power, must signify the power of God, exerted in miracles." (p. 30.) "Must;" Why so? That δυναμις often signifies miraculous power, is allowed---But what follows? That it must mean so in this place? That still remains to be proved. Indeed your Lordship says, this "appears from the following verse, in which is assigned the reason for using this method of proving Christianity to be true, viz. 'That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God.' By "the power of God" therefore must necessarily be understood, the miracles per-

formed by Christ and his Apostles." By the illative particle, *therefore*, this proposition should be an inference from some other, but what other I cannot yet discern. So that, for the present, I can only look upon it, as a fresh instance of begging the question.

"He goes on in the 7th, 10th, and following verses, to explain this demonstration of the Spirit and of power." But he does not say one syllable therein, either of the ancient prophecies, or of miracles. Nor will it be easily proved, that he speaks either of one or the other, from the beginning of the chapter to the end.

After transcribing the 13th verse, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual," your Lordship adds, "From which last passage it appears, that the words which the Holy Ghost is said to teach, must be the prophetical revelations of the Old Testament, which were discovered to the Apostles by the same Spirit." I cannot apprehend how this appears. I cannot, as yet, see any connexion at all between the premises and the conclusion.

Upon the whole, I desire any calm and serious man, to read over this whole chapter; and then he will easily judge, what is the natural meaning of the words in question: and whether (although it be allowed, that they were peculiarly fulfilled in the Apostles, yet) they do not manifestly belong, in a lower sense, to every true minister of Christ. For what can be more undeniable than this, that our preaching also is vain, unless it be attended with the power of that Spirit, who alone pierceth the heart? And that your hearing is vain, unless the same power be present to heal your soul, and to give you a faith which standeth not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God?

14. "Another passage that" (your Lordship thinks) "has been misapplied by enthusiasts, but was really peculiar to the times of the Apostles, is 1 John ii. 20, and 27, (p. 35,) 'Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things—But the anointing which ye have received of him

abideth in you: and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie. And even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.' Here the Apostle arms the true Christians against seducers, by an argument drawn from the unction from the Holy One, that was in, or rather among them: that is, from the immediate inspiration of some of their teachers." P. 37.

Here it rests upon your Lordship, to prove, (as well as affirm,) 1. That εν should be translated among: 2. That this unction from the Holy One means, "The inspiration of some of their teachers." The latter, your Lordship attempts to prove thus:

"The inspired teachers of old were set apart for that office, by an extraordinary effusion of the Holy Ghost: therefore (p. 38) The unction from the Holy One here, means such an effusion." I deny the consequence; so the question is still to be proved.

Your Lordship's second argument is drawn from the 26th verse of the 14th chapter of St. John's gospel. Proposed in form, it will stand thus: "If those words, 'He shall teach you all things,' relate only to a miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, then these words, 'The same anointing teacheth you of all things,' relate to the same miraculous gift:

But those words relate only to a miraculous gift:

Therefore, these relate to the same."

I conceive, it will not be very easy to make good the consequence in the first proposition. But I deny the minor also: the contradictory whereto, I trust, has appeared to be true.

I grant indeed, that these words were more eminently fulfilled in the age of the Apostles. But this is altogether consistent with their belonging in a lower sense to all Christians in all ages, seeing they have all need of an unction from the Holy One, a supernatural assistance from the Holy Ghost, that they may know in the due use of all proper means, all things needful for their souls health. Therefore it is no enthusiasm, to teach that the unction from the Holy One, belongs to all Christians in all ages.

15. There is one topic of your Lordship's yet untouched; that is, authority: one you have very frequently made use of, and wherein, probably, the generality of readers suppose your Lordship's great strength lies. And indeed when your Lordship first mentioned, (p. 11,) "The general sense of the primitive church," I presumed you would have produced so numerous authorities, that I should not easily be able to consult them all. But I soon found my mistake: your Lordship naming only Chrysostom, Jerome, Origen, and Athanasius.

However, though these four can no more be termed the primitive church, than the church universal, yet I consent to abide by their suffrage. Nay, I will go a step farther still. If any two of these affirm, that those seven texts belong only to the Apostolic age, and not to the Christians of succeeding times, I will give up the whole cause.

But let it be observed: if they should affirm, that these primarily belong to the Christians of the Apostolic age, that does not prove the point, because they may in a secondary sense belong to others notwithstanding: nor does any of them speak home to the question, unless he maintain in express terms, that these texts refer only to the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, and not at all to the state of ordinary Christians.

16. Concerning those three texts, John xiv. ver. 16, and 26; and John xvi. ver. 13, "I could easily add (says your Lordship*) the authorities of Chrysostom and the other commentators." St. Chrysostom's authority I will consider now, and that of the others, when they are produced.

It is granted, that he interprets not only John xvi. 13, but also both the passages in the 14th chapter, as primarily belonging to the Apostles. Yet part of his comment on the 26th verse, is as follows: "Such is that grace (of the Comforter) that if it finds sadness, it takes it away; if evil desire, it consumes it. It casts out fear, and suffers him that receives it to be a man no longer, but translates him, as it were, into heaven. Hence none of them counted any thing

* Page 15.

his own, but continued in prayer, with gladness and singleness of heart. For this chiefly is there need of the Holy Ghost. For the fruit of the Spirit is joy, peace, faith, meekness. Indeed spiritual men often grieve; but that grief is sweeter than joy. For whatever is of the Spirit, is the greatest gain, as whatever is of the world, is the greatest loss. Let us, therefore, in keeping the commandments," (according to our Lord's exhortation, ver. 15,) "secure the unconquerable assistance of the Spirit, and we shall be nothing inferior to angels."

St. Chrysostom here, after he had shewn, that the promise of the Comforter primarily belonged to the Apostles: (and who ever questioned it?) undeniably teaches, that in a secondary sense, it belongs to all Christians: to all spiritual men, all who keep the commandments. I appeal therefore to all mankind, whether his authority touching the promise of our Lord in these texts does not overthrow the proposition it was cited to prove?

Although your Lordship names no other author here, yet page 42, you say, "The assigned sense of these passages was confirmed by the authority of Origen." It is needful therefore to add, what occurs in his works, with regard to the present question. He occasionally mentions this promise of our Lord, in four several places. But it is in one only that he speaks pertinently to the point in hand, (vol. II. p. 403, edit. bened.) where his words are these: "'When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, and he will teach you all things.' The sum of all good things consists in this, that a man be found worthy to receive the grace of the Holy Ghost. Otherwise, nothing will be accounted perfect in him, who hath not the Holy Spirit." Do these words confirm that "sense of those passages which your Lordship had assigned?" Rather do they not utterly overturn it? And prove, (as above,) that although this promise of our Lord primarily belongs to the Apostles, yet in the secondary sense, it belongs (according to Origen's judgment) to all Christians in all ages?

17. The fourth text mentioned as belonging to the first Christians only, is Rom. viii. 15, 16, and p. 26, it is said,

"This interpretation is confirmed by the authority of the most eminent Fathers." The reader is particularly referred to Origen and *Jerome in locum.* But here seems to be a mistake of the name. *Jerome in locum* should mean, Jerome upon the place, upon Rom. viii. 15, 16. But I cannot perceive, that there is one word upon that place, in all St. Jerome's works. Nor indeed has Origen commented upon it any more than Jerome. But he occasionally mentions it in these words: "He is a babe who is fed with milk—but if he seek the things that are above—without doubt he will be of the number of those, 'who receive not the Spirit of bondage again unto fear, but the Spirit of adoption,' thro' whom they 'cry, Abba, Father.'" Vol. I. p. 79. Again, "The fulness of time is come—when they who are willing, receive the adoption, as Paul teaches in these words, 'Ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father!' And it is written in the gospel according to St. John, 'To as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his name.'" Vol. I. p. 231, 232. Yet again, "Every one that is born of God, and doth not commit sin, by his very actions saith, *Our Father which art in heaven,* 'the Spirit itself bearing witness with their spirit, that they are the children of God.'" Ibid. According to Origen therefore, this testimony of the Spirit is not any public testimony by miracles, peculiar to the first times, but an inward testimony, belonging in common to all that are born of God. And consequently the authority of Origen does not "confirm that interpretation" neither; but absolutely destroys it.

18. The last authority your Lordship appeals to on this text is, "That of the great John Chrysostom, who reckons the testimony of the Spirit of adoption by which we cry, Abba, Father! among the miraculous gifts of the Spirit." "I rather choose (your Lordship adds, p. 26) to refer you to the words of St. Chrysostom, than to transcribe them

here, as having almost translated them in the present account of the testimony of the Spirit."

However, I believe it will not be labour lost, to transcribe a few of those words. It is in his comment on the 14th verse, that he first mentions St. Paul's comparison between a Jew and a Christian. How fairly your Lordship has represented this, let every reader judge. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."—"Whereas the same title had been given of old to the Jews also,—he shews in the sequel, how great a difference there is, between that honour and this. For though, says he, the titles are the same, yet the things are not. And he plainly proves it, by comparing both what they had received, and what they looked for. And first he shews what they had received, viz. *A Spirit of Bondage.* Therefore he adds, 'Ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again unto fear: but ye have received the Spirit of adoption.' What means *the Spirit of fear?*——Observe their whole life, and you will know clearly. For punishments were at their heels, and much fear was on every side, and before their face—But with us, it is not so. For our mind and conscience are cleansed, so that we do all things well, not for fear of present punishment, but through our love of God, and a habit of virtue. They, therefore, though they were called sons, yet were as slaves; but we, being made free, have received the adoption, and look not for a land of milk and honey, but for heaven."

"He brings also another proof, that *we have the Spirit of adoption, by which,* says he, *we cry, Abba, Father.*—This is the first word we utter, μετα τας θαυμαςας ωδινας εκεινας, και τον ξενον και παραδοξον λοχευματων νομον: after those amazing throes (or birth-pangs) and that strange and wonderful manner of bringing forth.

"He brings yet another proof of the superiority of those who had this Spirit of adoption. 'The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God.' I prove this, says he, not only from the voice itself, but also from the cause whence that voice proceeds. For the Spirit

suggests the words while we thus speak, which he hath elsewhere expressed more plainly, 'God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father!' But what is, *The Spirit bearing witness with our spirit?* He means, the Paraclete by the gift given unto us." (But that this was an extraordinary gift, we have no intimation at all, neither before nor after.) "And when the Spirit beareth witness, what doubt is left? If a man or an angel spake, some might doubt. But when the Most High beareth witness to us, who can doubt any longer?"

Now let any reasonable man judge how far your Lordship has "translated the words of St. Chrysostom! And whether he reckons the testimony of the Spirit among the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost?" Or among those ordinary gifts of the Spirit of Christ, which if a man have not, he is none of his.

19. The fifth text your Lordship quotes, as describing a miraculous gift of the Spirit, is 1 Cor. xiv. 15: to prove which, you comment on the 8th chapter to the Romans, particularly the 26th verse: and here again it is said, "That the interpretation assigned, is confirmed by several of the most eminent Fathers, more especially the great John Chrysostom as well as by Origen and Jerome upon the place." I cannot find St. Jerome to have written one line upon the place. And it is obvious, that St. Chrysostom supposes the whole context from the 17th to the 25th verse, to relate to all Christians in all ages. How this can be said to "confirm the interpretation assigned," I cannot conjecture. Nay, it is remarkable, that he expounds the former part of the 26th verse, as describing the ordinary privilege of all Christians. Thus far, therefore, he does not confirm, but overthrow "the interpretation before assigned." But in the middle of the verse he breaks off, and expounds the latter part, as describing one of the miraculous gifts. Yet I must do the justice to this venerable man to observe, he does not suppose that miraculous gift was given, only that the inspired might do what any ordinary Christian might have done without it. This interpretation even of the

latter part of the verse, he does in no wise confirm. But that he might ask in every particular circumstance, the determinate thing which it was the will of God to give.

20. The third Father by whom it is said this interpretation is confirmed, is Origen. The first passage of his, which relates to Rom. viii. 26, runs thus: (Vol. I. p. 199.) "Paul perceiving how far he was, after all these things, from knowing to pray for what he ought as he ought, says, "We know not what we should pray for as we ought." But he adds, whence what is wanting may be had by one who indeed does not know, but labours to be found worthy of having the defect supplied. For he says, "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities. For we know not what we should pray for as we ought. But the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit; because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." The Spirit which crieth, Abba, Father, in the hearts of the saints, knowing well our groanings in this tabernacle, making intercession for us to God, with groanings which cannot be uttered. To the same effect is that scripture, 1 Cor. xiv. 15, "I will pray with the Spirit, I will pray with the understanding also." For our understanding (or mind ὁ νοῦς) cannot pray, if the Spirit do not pray before it, and the understanding, as it were, listen to it." Again, (Vol. II. p. 146,) I would know, how the saints cry to God without a voice. The Apostle shews, God "hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father!" And he adds, "The Spirit itself maketh intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered." And again, "He that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." Thus, therefore, the Spirit making intercession for us with God, the cry of the saints is heard without a voice." Once more in his Homily on Joshua, (Vol. II. p. 419,) "Jesus, our Lord, doth not forsake us; but altho' when we would pray, we know not what to pray for as we ought, yet the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with

groanings which cannot be uttered. Now the Lord is that Spirit: the Spirit assists our prayers, and offers them to God with groanings which we cannot express in words."

I believe all rational men will observe from hence, that Origen is so far from confirming, that he quite overturns your Lordship's interpretation of the 16th as well as the 26th verse of this chapter: seeing, in his judgment, both that testimony of the Spirit, and this prayer belong to all Christians in all ages.

21. The sixth scripture which your Lordship has undertaken to shew, "relates only to the Apostolic times," is 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5. And, this interpretation also, it is said, is confirmed by the authority of Chrysostom, Origen, and other ancient writers." (p. 33.) With those other "ancient writers" I have no concern yet. St. Chrysostom so far confirms this interpretation, as to explain that whole phrase, the demonstration of the Spirit and of power, of "the power of the Spirit shewn by miracles." But he says not one word, of any "Proof of the Christian Religion, arising from the types and prophecies of the Old Testament." Origen has these words, (Vol. I. p. 321,) "Our word has a certain, peculiar demonstration, more divine than the Grecian, logical demonstration. This the Apostle terms, The demonstration of the Spirit and of power: of the Spirit, because of the prophecies, sufficient to convince any one, especially of the things that relate to Christ; of power, because of the miraculous powers, some footsteps of which still remain." Hence we may doubtless infer, That Origen judged this text to relate, in its primary sense, to the Apostles: but can we thence infer, that he did not judge it to belong, in a lower sense, to all true ministers of Christ? Let us hear him speaking for himself in the same Treatise, p. 377. "And my speech and my preaching were not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God. Those who hear the word preached with power, are themselves filled with power," (N. B. Not the power of working miracles) which they demonstrate both in their disposition, and in their life,

and in their striving for the truth unto death. But some, although they profess to believe, have not this power of God in them, but are empty thereof." Did Origen then believe, that the power mentioned in this text, belonged only to the Apostolical age? "See the force of the word, conquering believers by a persuasiveness attended with the power of God! I speak this to shew the meaning of them that said, 'And my speech and my preaching were not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.' This divine saying means, That what is spoken is not sufficient of itself, although it be true and most worthy to be believed, to pierce a man's soul, if there be not also a certain power from God given to the speaker, and grace bloom upon what is spoken, and this grace cannot be but from God."

After observing, That this is the very passage which your Lordship mentions at the close of the other, but does not cite it, I desire every unprejudiced person to judge, whether Origen does not clearly determine, that the power, spoken of in this text, is, in some measure, given to all true ministers in all ages?

22. The last scripture which your Lordship affirms "to be peculiar to the times of the Apostles," is that in the first Epistle of St. John, concerning the unction of the Holy One. To confirm this interpretation, we are referred to the authority of Origen and Chrysostom, on the parallel passages in St. John's gospel, p. 42. But it has appeared, That both these Fathers suppose those passages to belong to all Christians. And consequently their authority (if these are parallel passages) stands full against this interpretation. Your Lordship subjoins, "I shall here only add that of the great Athanasius, who (in his epistle to Serapion) interprets the unction from the Holy One, not merely of divine grace, but of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit." Nay, it is enough, if he interprets it at all of ordinary grace, such as is common to all Christians. And this your Lordship allows he does. But I cannot allow that he interprets it of

any thing else. I cannot perceive, that he interprets it at all "of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit." His words are, "The Holy Spirit is called, and is, the unction and the seal. For John writes, 'The anointing which ye have received of him, abideth in you; and ye need not that any man should teach you, but as his anointing,' his Spirit. 'He teacheth you of all things.' Again, it is written in the prophet Isaiah, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me.' And Paul writes thus: 'In whom also ye were sealed.' And again, 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.' This anointing is the breath of the Son, so that he who hath the Spirit may say, *We are the sweet smelling savour of Christ.* Because we are partakers of the Holy Spirit, we have the Son: and, having the Son, we have the Spirit, crying in our hearts, Abba, Father." And so, in his Oration against the Arians: "He sendeth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. His Son in us, invoking the Father, makes him to be called our Father. Certainly God cannot be called their Father, who have not the Son in their hearts."

Is it not easy to be observed here, 1. That Athanasius makes that testimony of the Spirit, common to all the children of God: 2. That he joins the anointing of the Holy One, with that seal of the Spirit wherewith all that persevere are sealed to the day of redemption: and, 3. That he does not, throughout this passage, speak of the extraordinary gifts at all?

Therefore, upon the whole, the sense of the primitive church, so far as it can be gathered from the authors above cited, is, "That "although some of these scriptures primarily refer to those extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, which were given to the Apostles and a few other persons in the Apostolic age: yet they refer also, in a secondary sense, to those ordinary operations of the Holy Spirit, which all the children of God do and will experience, even to the end of the world."

23. What I mean by the ordinary operations of the Holy Ghost, I sum up in the words of a modern writer:

"Sanctification being opposed to our corruption, and answering fully to the latitude thereof, whatsoever of holiness and perfection is wanting in our nature, must be supplied by the Spirit of God. Wherefore by nature we are totally void of knowing the Will of God; this Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God, and revealeth them to the sons of men, so that thereby the darkness of their understanding is expelled, and they are enlightened with the knowledge of God. The same Spirit which revealeth the object of faith, generally to the universal Church, doth also illuminate the understanding of such as believe, that they may receive the truth. For faith is the gift of God, not only in the object, but also in the act. And this gift is a gift of the Holy Ghost working within us—And as the increase of perfection, so the original of faith is from the Spirit of God, by an internal illumination of the soul.

"The second part of the office of the Holy Ghost is, the renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul. For our natural corruption consisting in an aversation of our wills, and a depravation of our affections, an inclination of them to the Will of God, is wrought within us by the Spirit of God.

"The third part of this office is, To lead, direct, and govern us in our actions and conversations. If we live in the Spirit, quickened by his renovation, we must also walk in the Spirit, following his direction, led by his manuduction. We are also animated and acted by the Spirit of God, who giveth both to will and to do: and * as many as are thus led by the Spirit of God, are the Sons of God. Moreover, that this direction may prove more effectual, we are guided in our prayers by the same Spirit: according to the promise, 'I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the Spirit of grace and supplication,' (Zech. xii. 10.) Whereas then 'this is the confidence which we have in him, that if we ask any thing

* Rom. viii. 14.

according to his will, he heareth us:' and whereas 'we know not what we should pray for as we ought, * the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered:' and † 'he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the Will of God.' From which intercession," made for all true christians, "he hath the ‡ name of the Paraclete given him by Christ, who said, 'I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete.' For 'if any man sin, we have a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,' saith St. John: 'who maketh intercession for us,' saith St. Paul, (Rom. viii. 34.) And we have § another Paraclete, saith our Saviour: ‖ 'which also maketh intercession for us,' saith St. Paul. A Paraclete then, in the notion of the Scriptures, is an Intercessor."

"It is also the office of the Holy Ghost, to assure us of the adoption of Sons, to create in us a sense of the paternal love of God towards us, to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. 'The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.' For 'as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God. And because we are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father.' ¶ 'For we have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear, but we have received the Spirit of Adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father: the Spirit itself bearing witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God.'

"As, therefore, we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also by the same Spirit assured of our Adoption. Because being *Sons we are also heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ*, by the same Spirit we have the pledge, or rather the earnest of our inheritance. For he which establisheth us in Christ,

* *Rom.* viii. 26. † *Ver.* 27. ‡ *John* xiv. 16. 26. § *John* xiv. 16. ‖ *Rom.* viii. 27. ¶ *Ver.* 15, 16.

and hath anointed us, is God: who hath also sealed us, and hath given us the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts: so that we are sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance. The Spirit of God, as given unto us in this life, is to be looked upon as an earnest, being part of that reward which is promised, and, upon performance of the covenant which God hath made with us, certainly to be received."

Your Lordship observed, that "the interpretation of those passages, which relate to the *unction from the Holy One*, depends on the sense of those other passages of holy Scripture, particularly those in St. John's Gospel." Now if so, then these words fix the sense of six out of the seven texts in question; and every one of them, in the judgment of this writer, describes the *ordinary gifts* bestowed on all Christians.

It now rests with your Lordship, to take your choice; either to condemn or acquit both. Either your Lordship must condemn Bishop Pearson for an *Enthusiast*, a man no ways inferior to Bishop Chrysostom: or you must acquit me: for I have his express authority on my side, concerning every text which I affirm to belong to all Christians.

24. But I have greater authority than this, and such as I reverence, only less than that of the Oracles of God. I mean that of our own Church. I shall close this head, by setting down what occurs in her authentic records, concerning either our *receiving the Holy Ghost*, or his ordinary operations in all true Christians.

In her daily service, she teaches us all to beseech God, "to grant us his Holy Spirit, that those things may please him which we do at this present, and that the rest of our life may be pure and holy;" to pray for our Sovereign Lord the King, that God would replenish him with the Grace of his Holy Spirit; for all the Royal Family, that they may be endued with his Holy Spirit, and enriched with his Heavenly Grace: for all the Clergy and people, that he would send down upon them the healthful Spirit of his Grace: for the Catholic Church, that it may be guided and

governed by his good Spirit: and for all therein who at any time make their common supplications unto him, that the fellowship or communication of the Holy Ghost may be with them all evermore.

Her collects are full of petitions to the same effect: "* Grant that we may daily be renewed by thy Holy Spirit. † Grant that in all our sufferings here, for the testimony of thy truth, we may by faith behold the glory that shall be revealed, and being filled with the Holy Ghost, may love and bless our persecutors. ‡ Send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity. § O Lord, from whom all good things do come, grant to us thy humble servants, that by thy *holy inspiration* we may think those things that are good, and by thy merciful guidance may perform the same. ‖ We beseech thee, leave us not comfortless, but send to us the Holy Ghost to comfort us. ¶ Grant us by the same spirit to have a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in his holy comfort. (N. B. The Church here teaches all Christians to claim *the Comforter*, in virtue of the promise made, John xiv.) ** Grant us, Lord, we beseech thee, the spirit to think and do always such things as be rightful. †† O God, forasmuch as without thee, we are not able to please thee, mercifully grant that thy Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts. ‡‡ Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy Holy Name. Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant (or this person) that he may be born again.—Give thy Holy Spirit to these persons, (N. B. already baptized) that they may continue thy servants. Almighty God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these persons by water and the Holy Ghost—Strengthen them with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in

* *Collect for Christmas Day.* † *St. Stephen's Day.* ‡ *Quinquagesima Sunday.* § *Fifth Sunday after Easter.* ‖ *Sunday after Ascension Day.* ¶ *Whitsunday.* ** *Ninth Sunday after Trinity.* †† *Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity.* ‡‡ *Communion Office.*

them the manifold gifts of thy grace." *Office of Confirmation.*

From these passages it may sufficiently appear, for what purposes every Christian, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, does now *receive the Holy Ghost.* But this will be still more clear from those that follow: wherein the reader may likewise observe, a plain, rational sense of God's revealing himself to us, of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and of a Believer's feeling in himself the mighty working of the Spirit of Christ.

25. "God gave them of old, grace to be his children, as he doth us now. But now, by the coming of our Saviour Christ, *we have received* more abundantly *the Spirit of God* in our hearts." *Homily on Faith.* Part. II. "He died to destroy the rule of the devil in us, and he rose again to send down his Holy Spirit, to rule in our hearts." *Homily on the Resurrection.* "We have the Holy Spirit in our hearts, as a seal and pledge of our everlasting inheritance. *Ibid.* "The Holy Ghost sat upon each of them, like as it had been cloven tongues of fire: to teach, that it is he that giveth eloquence and utterance in preaching the gospel; which engendereth a burning zeal towards God's word, and giveth all men a tongue, yea, a fiery tongue. (N. B. Whatever occurs in any of the Journals, of God's "giving me utterance," or "enabling me to speak with power," cannot therefore be quoted as Enthusiasm, without wounding the Church through my side.) "So that if any man be a dumb Christian, not professing his faith openly, he giveth men occasion to doubt, lest he have not the grace of the Holy Ghost within him." *Homily on Whitsunday,* Part I.

"It is the office of the Holy Ghost to sanctify: which the more it is hid from our understanding," (i. e. the particular manner of his working) "the more it ought to move all men, to wonder at the secret and mighty workings of God's Holy Spirit which is within us. For it is the Holy Ghost that doth quicken the minds of men, stirring up godly motions in their hearts. Neither doth he think it

†

sufficient inwardly to work the new birth of man, unless he doth also dwell and abide in him. 'Know ye not,' saith St. Paul, 'that ye are the Temple of God, and that his Spirit dwelleth in you? Know ye not that your bodies are the Temples of the Holy Ghost which is within you?' Again he saith, 'Ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit,' for why? 'The Spirit of God dwelleth in you.' To this, agreeth St. John, * 'The anointing which ye have received,' (he meaneth the Holy Ghost) 'abideth in you.' And St. Peter saith the same, 'The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you.' O what comfort is this to the heart of a true Christian, to think that the Holy Ghost dwelleth in him! 'If God be with us,' as the Apostle saith, 'who can be against us?' He giveth patience and joyfulness of heart, in temptation and affliction, and is therefore worthily called † *The Comforter.* He doth instruct the hearts of the simple, in the knowledge of God and his word; therefore he is justly termed ‡ *The Spirit of Truth.* And where the Holy Ghost doth instruct and teach, there is no delay at all in learning." *Ibid.*

From this passage I learn, 1. That every true Christian now *receives the Holy Ghost*, as *the Paraclete* or *Comforter* promised by our Lord, John xiv. 13. 2. That every Christian receives him as *the Spirit of Truth* (promised John xvi.) to *teach all things:* And, 3. That the anointing mentioned in the first Epistle of St. John, abides in every Christian.

26. "In reading of God's word, he profiteth most, that is most inspired with the Holy Ghost." *Homily on reading the Scripture.* Part I. "Human and worldly wisdom is not needful to the understanding of Scripture, but the revelation of the Holy Ghost, who inspireth the true meaning unto them that with humility and diligence search for it." *Ibid.* Part II. "Make him know and feel, that there is no other name under heaven given unto men, whereby we can be saved." "If we feel our conscience

* *John* ii. 27. † *John* xiv. 16. ‡ *John* xvi. 13.

at peace with God, through remission of our sins,---all is of God." *Homily on Rogation Week.* Part II. "If you feel such a faith in you, rejoice in it, and let it be daily increasing by well-working." *Homily on Faith.* Part III. "The faithful may feel wrought tranquillity of conscience, the increase of faith and hope, with many other graces of God." *Homily on the Sacrament.* Part I. "Godly men feel inwardly God's Holy Spirit, inflaming their hearts with love." *Homily on certain places of Scripture.* Part I. "God give us grace, to know these things, and to feel them in our hearts! this knowledge and feeling is not of ourselves. Let us therefore meekly call upon the bountiful Spirit, the Holy Ghost, to inspire us with his presence, that we may be able to hear the goodness of God to our salvation. For without his lively inspiration, can we not so much as speak the name of the Mediator. 'No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.' Much less should we be able to believe and know these great mysteries, that be opened to us by Christ. 'But we have received,' saith St. Paul, 'not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God;' for this purpose, 'that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God.' In the power of the Holy Ghost resteth all ability to know God and to please him. It is he that purifieth the mind by his secret working. He enlighteneth the heart, to conceive worthy thoughts of almighty God. He sitteth in the tongue of man, to stir him to speak his honour. He only ministereth spiritual strength to the powers of the soul and body. And if we have any gift, whereby we may profit our neighbour, all is wrought by this one and the self-same Spirit." *Homily for Rogation Week.* Part III.

27. Every proposition which I have any where advanced, concerning those operations of the Holy Ghost, which I believe are common to all christians in all ages, is here clearly maintained by our own church. Under a full sense of this, I could not well understand for many years, how it was, that on the mentioning any of these great truths, even among men of education, the cry, immediately arose, "an

Enthusiast! an Enthusiast!" but I now plainly perceive, this is only an old fallacy in a new shape. To object Enthusiasm to any person or doctrine, is but a decent method of begging the question. It generally spares the objector the trouble of reasoning, and is a shorter and easier way of carrying his cause. For instance, I assert that "till a man *receives the Holy Ghost*, he is without God in the world; that he cannot know the things of God, unless God reveal them unto him by his Spirit: no, nor have even one holy or heavenly temper, without the inspiration of the Holy One." Now should one who is conscious to himself, that he has experienced none of these things, attempt to confute these propositions, either from Scripture or antiquity, it might prove a difficult task. What then shall he do? Why, cry out, "Enthusiasm! Enthusiasm!" and the work is done. But what does he mean by Enthusiasm? perhaps nothing at all: few have any distinct idea of its meaning. Perhaps, "something very bad," or "something I never experienced and do not understand." Shall I tell you then, what that "terrible something" is? I believe, thinking men mean by Enthusiasm, a sort of religious madness; a false imagination of being inspired by God: and by an Enthusiast, one that fancies himself under the influence of the Holy Ghost, when, in fact, he is not. Let him prove me guilty of this, who can. I will tell you once more the whole of my belief on these heads. And if any man will shew me (by arguments, not hard names) what is wrong, I will thank God and him.

28. Every good gift is from God, and is given to man by the Holy Ghost. By nature there is in us no good thing. And there can be none, but so far, as it is wrought in us by that good Spirit. Have we any true knowledge of what is good? This is not the result of our natural understanding. *The natural man discerneth not the things of the Spirit of God:* so that we never can discern them, until God *reveals them unto us by his Spirit. Reveals*, that is, unveils, uncovers; gives us to know what we did not know before. Have we love? *It is shed abroad in our hearts, by*

the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. He inspires, breathes, infuses into our soul, what of ourselves we could not have. Does our spirit rejoice in God our Saviour? It is *joy in* (or by) *the Holy Ghost.* Have we true inward peace? It is *the peace of God,* wrought in us by the same Spirit. Faith, peace, joy, love, are all his fruits. And as we are figuratively said, to see the light of faith, so by a like figure of speech we are said to feel, this peace, and joy, and love: that is, we have an inward experience of them, which we cannot find any fitter word to express.

The reasons why in speaking of these things I use those terms, (inspiration particularly) are, 1. Because they are scriptural. 2. Because they are used by our Church. 3. Because I know none better. The word "*influence* of the Holy Ghost," which I suppose you use, is both a far stronger and a less natural term than inspiration. It is far stronger; even as far as "flowing into the soul" is a stronger expression than "breathing upon it." And less natural; as breathing bears a near relation to spirit; to which flowing in, has only a distant relation. "But you thought I had meant immediate inspiration." So I do, or I mean nothing at all. Nor, indeed, such inspiration as is *sine mediis.* But all inspiration, though by means, is immediate. Suppose, for instance, you are employed in private prayer, and God pours his love into your heart. God then acts immediately on your soul: and the love of him which you then experience, is as immediately breathed into you by the Holy Ghost, as if you had lived 1700 years ago. Change the term. Say, "God then assists you to love him?" Well, and is not this immediate assistance? Say, "His Spirit concurs with yours." You gain no ground. It is immediate concurrence or none at all. God, a spirit, acts upon your spirit. Make it out any otherwise if you can. I cannot conceive, how that harmless word, immediate, came to be such a bugbear in the world: "why, I thought you meant such inspiration as the Apostles had; and such receiving the Holy Ghost, as that was at the day of Pentecost." I do, in part: indeed I do not mean, that Christians

now receive the Holy Ghost, in order to work miracles: but they do doubtless now receive, yea, *are filled with the Holy Ghost*, in order to be filled with the fruits of that blessed Spirit. And he inspires into all true believers now, a degree of the same peace, and joy, and love, which the Apostles felt in themselves on that day, when they were first *filled with the Holy Ghost*.

29. I have now considered the most material objections I know, which have been lately made against the great doctrines I teach. I have produced, so far as in me lay, the strength of those objections, and then answered them, I hope, in the spirit of meekness. And now I trust it appears, that these doctrines are no other than the doctrines of Jesus Christ: that they are all evidently contained in the word of God, by which alone I desire to stand or fall; and that they are fundamentally the same with the doctrines of the Church of England, of which I do, and ever did profess myself a Member.

But there remains one objection, which though relating to the head of Doctrine, yet is independent on all that went before. And that is, "You cannot agree in your doctrines among yourselves. One holds one thing and one another. Mr. Whitefield anathematizes Mr. Wesley; and Mr. Wesley anathematizes Mr. Whitefield. And yet each pretends to be led by the Holy Ghost, by the infallible Spirit of God! Every reasonable man must conclude from hence, that neither the one nor the other is led by that Spirit." I need not say, how continually this has been urged, both in common conversation and from the press: I am grieved to add, and from the pulpit too; for if the argument were good, it would overturn the Bible. Nor, how great stress has been continually laid upon it: whoever proposes it, proposes it as demonstration, and generally claps his wings, as being quite assured, it will admit of no answer. And, indeed, I am in doubt, whether it does admit, I am sure it does not require, any other answer, than that coarse one of the countryman to the Romish Champion, "Bellarmine, thou liest." For every proposition contained herein,

is grossly, shamelessly false. 1. "You cannot agree in your doctrines among yourselves."—Who told you so? All our fundamental doctrines, I have recited above. And in every one of these we do, and have agreed for several years. In these, we hold one and the same thing. In smaller points, each of us thinks, and lets think. 2. "Mr. Whitefield anathematizes Mr. Wesley." Another shameless untruth. Let any one read what Mr. Whitefield wrote, even in the heat of controversy, and he will be convinced of the contrary. 3. "And Mr. Wesley anathematizes Mr. Whitefield." This is equally false and scandalous. I reverence Mr. Whitefield, both as a child of God, and a true Minister of Jesus Christ. 4. "And yet each pretends to be led by the Holy Ghost, by the infallible Spirit of God." Not in our private opinions: nor does either of us pretend to be any farther led by the Spirit of God, than every Christian must pretend to be, unless he will deny the Bible. For only as many as are led by the Spirit of God, are the Sons of God. Therefore, if you do not pretend to be led by him too, yea, if it be not so in fact, you are none of his. And now, what is become of your demonstration? Leave it to the carmen and porters, its just proprietors: to the zealous apple-women that cry after me in the street, "This is he that rails at the *Whole Duty* of Man." But let every one that pretends to learning or reason, be ashamed to mention it any more.

30. The first inference, easily deduced from what has been said, is, "That we are not false Prophets." In one sense of the word, we are no Prophets at all; for we do not foretel things to come. But in another, wherein every Minister is a Prophet, we are. For we do speak in the name of God. Now a false Prophet, in this sense of the word, is one, who declares as the Will of God, what is not so. But we declare, as has been shewn at large, nothing else as the Will of God, but what is evidently contained in his written word, as explained by our own church. Therefore, unless you can prove the Bible to be a false book, you cannot possibly prove us to be false Prophets. The text

which is generally cited on this occasion, is Matthew vii. ver. 15. But how unhappily chosen! In the preceding chapters, our Lord had been describing that righteousness which exceeds the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, and without which we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven: even the life of God in the soul; holiness of heart, producing all holiness of conversation. In this, he closes that rule which sums up the whole, with those solemn words, "Enter ye in at the strait gate:" (such indeed is that of universal holiness) "For wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction." The gate of hell is wide as the whole earth; the way of unholiness is broad as the great deep. "And many there be which go in thereat;" yea, and excuse themselves in so doing, "Because strait is the gate and narrow the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." It follows, *Beware of false Prophets;* of those who speak as from God, what God hath not spoken; those who shew you any other way to life, than that which I have now shewn. So that the false Prophets, here spoken of, are those who point out any other way to heaven than this; who teach men to find a wider gate, a broader way, than that described in the foregoing chapters. But it has been abundantly shewn, that we do not. Therefore (whatever we are beside) we are not false Prophets.

Neither are we, as has been frequently and vehemently affirmed, *deceivers of the people.* If we teach "the truth as it is in Jesus," if we "speak as the oracles of God," it follows, that we do not deceive those that hear, though they should believe whatever we speak. "Let God be true and every man a liar:" every man that contradicts his truth. But he will be "justified in his saying, and clear when he is judged."

One thing more I infer, "That we are not Enthusiasts." This accusation has been considered at large: and the main arguments hitherto brought to support it, have been weighed in the balance and found wanting: particularly this, "That none but Enthusiasts suppose

either that * promise of the Comforter, or the † witness of the Spirit, or ‡ that unutterable prayer, or § the Unction from the Holy One, to belong, in common, to all Christians." O, my Lord, how deeply have you condemned the generation of God's children! Whom have you represented as rank, dreaming Enthusiasts? As either deluded or designing men? Not only Bishop Pearson, a man hitherto accounted both sound in heart, and of good understanding; but likewise Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, Bishop Latimer, Bishop Hooper; and all the venerable compilers of our Liturgy and Homilies: all the members of both the Houses of Convocation, by whom they were revised and approved: yea, King Edward, and all his Lords and Commons together, by whose authority they were established! And, with these modern Enthusiasts, Origen, Chrysostom, and Athanasius, are comprehended in the same censure!

I grant, a Deist might rank both us and them, in the number of religious madmen: nay, ought so to do, on his supposition, that the gospel is but a cunningly-devised fable. And on this ground, some of them have done so in fact. One of them was asking me, several years since, "What! are you one of the Knight-Errants? How, I pray, got Quixotism into your head? You want nothing: you have a good provision for life; and are in a way of preferment; and must you leave all, to fight windmills; to convert savages in America?" I could only reply, "Sir, if the Bible is a lie, I am as very a madman as you can conceive. But if it be true, I am in my senses. I am neither madman nor Enthusiast." "For there is no man who hath left father or mother, or wife, or house, or land, for the gospel's sake; but he shall receive a hundred fold, in this world, with persecutions, and in the world to come, eternal life."

Nominal, outside Christians too, men of form may pass

* *John* xiv. 16, 26. xvi. 13. † *Rom.* viii. 15, 16. ‡ *Rom.* viii. 26, 27. § 1 *John* ii. 20, 27.

the same judgment. For we give up all our pretensions to what they account happiness, for what they, with the Deists, believe to be a mere dream. We expect, therefore, to pass for Enthusiasts with these also. But wisdom is justified of all her children.

32. I cannot conclude this head without one obvious remark. Suppose we really were Enthusiasts; suppose our doctrines were false, and unsupported either by reason, scripture, or authority: then, why hath not some one, who is a wise man, and endued with knowledge among you, attempted, at least, to show us our fault in love and meekness of wisdom? "Brethren, if ye have bitter zeal in your hearts, your wisdom descendeth not from above. The wisdom that is from above, is pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy" or pity. Does this spirit appear in one single Tract, of all those which have been published against us? Is there one Writer that has reproved us in love? Bring it to a single point. "Love hopeth all things." If you had loved us in any degree, you would have hoped, that God would some time give us the knowledge of his truth. But where shall we find even this slender instance of love? Has not every one who has written at all (I do not remember so much as one exception) treated us as incorrigible? Brethren, how is this? Why do you labour to teach us an evil lesson against yourselves? O may God never suffer others to deal with you, as ye have dealt with us!

VI. 1. Before I enter upon the consideration of those objections, which have been made to the manner of our preaching, I believe it may be satisfactory to some readers if I relate how I began to preach in this manner.

I was ordained Deacon in 1725, and Priest, in the year following. But it was many years after this before I was convinced of the great truths above recited. During all that time I was utterly ignorant of the nature and condition of justification. Sometimes I confounded it with sanctification, particularly when I was in Georgia. At other times I had some confused notion about the forgiveness of

sins: but then I took it for granted, the time of this must be, either the hour of death, or the day of judgment. I was equally ignorant of the nature of saving faith; apprehending it to mean no more, than a "Firm assent to all the propositions contained in the Old and New Testament."

2. As soon as, by the great blessing of God, I had a clearer view of these things, I began to declare them to others also. I believed, and therefore I spake. Wherever I was now desired to preach, salvation by faith was my only theme. My constant subjects were, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." "Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins." These I explained and enforced with all my might, both in every Church where I was asked to preach, and occasionally in the Religious Societies of London and Westminster; to some or other of which I was continually pressed to go, by the Stewards or other Members of them. Things were in this posture, when I was told, "I must preach no more in this, and this, and another Church:" the reason was usually added without reserve, "Because you preach such doctrine." So much the more those who could not hear me there, flocked together when I was at any of the Societies; where I spoke more or less, though with much inconvenience, to as many as the room I was in would contain.

3. But after a time, finding those rooms could not contain a tenth part of the people that were earnest to hear, I determined to do the same thing in England, which I had often done in a warmer climate: namely, when the house would not contain the congregation, to preach in the open air. This I accordingly did, first at Bristol, where the Society-rooms were exceeding small, and at Kingswood, where we had no room at all: afterwards in or near London. And I cannot say, I have ever seen a more awful sight, than when on Rose Green, or the top of Hannam-Mount, some thousands of people were calmly joined together in solemn waiting upon God, while

"They stood and under open air ador'd
The God who made both air, earth, heav'n, and sky."

And whether they were listening to his word, with attention still as night; or were lifting up their voice in praise, as the sound of many waters; many a time have I been constrained to say in my heart, "How dreadful is this place!" this also is no other than "the House of God! this is the Gate of Heaven!"

Be pleased to observe, 1. That I was forbidden, as by a general consent, to preach in any church, though not by any judicial sentence, "for preaching such doctrine." This was the open, avowed cause: there was at that time no other, either real or pretended; 2. That I had no desire or design to preach in the open air, till long after this prohibition; 3. That when I did, as it was no matter of choice, so neither of premeditation. There was no scheme at all previously formed, which was to be supported thereby; nor had I any other end in view than this, to save as many souls as I could. 4. *Field-preaching* was therefore a sudden expedient, a thing submitted to, rather than chosen; and therefore submitted to, because I thought preaching even thus, better than not preaching at all: First, in regard to my own soul, because, a dispensation of the gospel being committed to me, I did not dare, not to preach the gospel: Secondly, in regard to the souls of others, whom I every where saw, *seeking death in the error of their life.*

4. But the author of *the Observations* and of *the Case of the Methodists briefly stated, more particularly in the point of Field-preaching*, thinks *field-preaching* worse than not preaching at all, "because it is illegal."

Your argument in form runs thus:

"That preaching which is contrary to the laws of the land, is worse than not preaching at all:

But field *preaching is contrary* to the laws of the land.

Therefore, it is worse than not preaching at all."

The first proposition is not self-evident, nor indeed universally true. For the preaching of all the primitive Christians was contrary to the whole tenor of the Roman laws: the worship of their devil gods being established by the strongest laws then in being. Nor is it ever true, but on

supposition that the preaching in question is an indifferent thing.

But waving this, I deny the second proposition; I deny that *field-preaching* is contrary to the laws of our land. To prove which, you begin thus, "It does not appear, that any of the preachers among the Methodists, have qualified themselves and the places of their assembling, according to the Act of Toleration." I answer, 1. That act grants toleration to those who dissent from the Established Church. But we do not dissent from it. Therefore we cannot make use of that act. 2. That act exempts Dissenters from penalties consequent on their breach of preceding laws. But we are not conscious of breaking any law at all. Therefore we need not make use of it.

In the next section you say, "They have broken through all these provisions, in open defiance of government: and have met not only in houses, but in the fields, notwithstanding the statute (22 Car. II. c. 1.) which forbids this by name."

I answer, 1. We do nothing in defiance of government. We reverence Magistrates as the ministers of God. 2. Altho' we have met in the fields, yet we do not conceive that statute at all affects us, not only because that act points wholly at Dissenters; whereas we are members of the Established Church; but also because (they are your own words) it was evidently intended to suppress and prevent sedition: whereas no sedition, nor any the least approach thereto, can with any colour be laid to our charge.

In your 3d section you affirm, "That the Act of Toleration itself cannot secure us in field-preaching, from the penalties of former laws." We have no desire it should; as not apprehending ourselves to be condemned by any former law whatever. Nor does what you add, "That the Act of Toleration forbids any assembly of persons dissenting from the Church of England, to meet with the doors locked," affect us at all; because we do not dissent from it.

5. In the case of the Methodists briefly stated, your first observation is, "The Act of Toleration leaves them liable

to the penalties of several statutes made against unlawful assemblies." I suppose then these several statutes specify what those unlawful assemblies are: and whether unlawful, as being condemned by previous laws, or made unlawful by those statutes. And it still remains to be proved, that our assemblies are unlawful, in one or other of these senses. You next observe, that, "the Dissenters of all denominations, qualify themselves according to the Act of Toleration; otherwise, they are liable to the penalties of all the laws recited in this act." I answer, as before, all this strikes wide. It relates wholly to "persons dissenting from the Church." But we are not the men. We do not dissent from the Church. Whoever affirms it, we put him to the proof.

You go on, "One of those laws so related (viz. 22 Car. II. c. I.) is that which forbids field-preaching by name; and was evidently intended, not only to suppress, but also to prevent sedition. As the title of the act declares, and as the preamble expresses it, *to provide farther and more speedy remedies against it*." Was this then, in your own judgment, the evident intention of that act, viz. To provide remedies against sedition? Does the very title of the act declare this? And the preamble also express it? With what justice then, with what ingenuity or candor, with what shadow of truth or reason, can any man cite this act against us? Whom you yourself no more suspect of a design to raise sedition, I appeal to your own conscience in the sight of God, than of a design to blow up the city of London.

6. Hitherto therefore it hath not been made to appear, that field-preaching is contrary to any law in being. However, "It is dangerous." This you strongly insist on. "It may be attended with mischievous consequences. It may give advantages to the enemies of the established government. It is big with mischief." Observations, sect. I. and II. With what mischief? Why, "evil-minded men, by meeting together in the fields, under pretence of religion, may raise riots and tumults; or by meeting secretly, may carry on private cabals against the state." *Case of the Methodists*, p. 2. "And if the Methodists themselves are

a harmless and loyal people, it is nothing to the point hand. For disloyal and seditious persons may use such opportunity of getting together, in order to execute a private design. Mr. Whitefield says, 30, 50, or 80, have attended his preaching at once. Now, 1. He can know one tenth part of such a congregation. 2. All peo may come and carry on what designs they will: therefo 3. This is a great opportunity put into the hands of se tious persons to raise disturbances." "With what sa to the public these field-preachings may be continued, let world judge." *Ibid.* p. 2, 3, 4.

May I speak without offence? I cannot think you ar earnest. You do not mean what you say. Do you belie Mr. Whitefield had *eighty thousand* hearers at once? more than you believe he had *eighty millions.* Is all this talk of danger, mere finessse? Thrown in pu *ad movendum invidiam?* You know governments gener are suspicious; especially in time of war: and therefo apply, as you suppose, to their weak side; in hopes, if p sible, to deliver over these heretics to the secular a However, I will answer, as if you spoke from your he For I am in earnest, if you are not.

1. "The Preacher cannot know a tenth part of his c gregation." Let us come to the present state of thi The largest congregations that now attend the preachin any Methodist, are those (God be merciful to me!) t attend mine. And cannot I know a tenth part of one these congregations, either at Bristol, Kingswood, Ne castle, or London? As strange as it may seem, I gener know two-thirds of the congregation in every place even Sunday evenings, and nine in ten of those who attend at m other times. 2. "All people may come and carry on what signs they will." Not so. All field-preaching is now in open day. And were only ten persons to come to such assembly with arms, it would soon be inquired, with what sign they came. This is therefore, 3. No "great opportun put into the hands of seditious persons to raise disturbance And if ever any disturbance has been raised, it was qu

of another kind. The public then is entirely safe, if it be in no other danger than arises from field-preaching.

7. There is one other sentence belonging to this head, in the eighth section of the Observations. "The religious societies," you say, "in London and Westminster, for many years past, have received no discouragements, but on the contrary have been countenanced and encouraged both by the Bishops and Clergy." How is this? Have they then "qualified themselves and the places of their assembling according to the Act of Toleration?" Have they "embraced the protection which that act might give them, in case they complied with the conditions of it? If not, are they not all "liable to the penalties of the several statutes made before that time against unlawful assemblies?" How can they escape? Have they "qualified themselves for holding these separate assemblies, according to the tenor of that act?" "Have then the several members thereof taken the oaths to the government?" And are the "doors of the places wherein they meet, always open at the times of such meetings?" I presume, you know they are not; and that neither "the persons nor places are so qualified as that act directs." How then came "the Bishops and Clergy to countenance and encourage" unlawful assemblies? If it be said, "they meet in a private, inoffensive way;" that is nothing to the point in hand. If those meetings are unlawful in themselves, all their inoffensiveness will not make them lawful. "O but they behave with modesty and decency." Very well; but the law! What is that to the law? There can be no solid defence but this: they are not dissenters from the Church; therefore they cannot use, and they do not need the Act of Toleration. And their meetings are not seditious; therefore the statute against seditious meetings does not affect them. The application is obvious. If our meetings are illegal, so are theirs also. But if this plea be good, as doubtless it is, in one case, it is good in the other also.

8. You propose another objection to our manner of preaching, in the second part of the Observations. The

substance of it I will repeat, and answer as briefly as I can. "They run up and down from place to place, and from county to county:" that is, *they preach in several places.* This is undoubtedly true. "They draw after them confused multitudes of people:" that is, *many come to hear them.* This is true also. "But they would do well to remember, God is not the author of confusion or of tumult, but of peace." I trust we do; nor is there any confusion or tumult at all, in our largest congregations: unless at some rare times when the sons of Belial mix therewith, on purpose to disturb the peaceable worshippers of God. "But our Church has provided against this preaching up and down, in the ordination of a Priest, by expressly limiting the exercise of the powers then conferred upon him, to the congregation where he shall be lawfully appointed thereunto."

I answer, 1. Your argument proves too much. If it be allowed just as you propose it, it proves, that no Priest has authority, either to preach or minister the sacraments, in any other than his own congregation. 2. Had the powers conferred been so limited when I was ordained Priest, my ordination would have signified just nothing. For I was not appointed to any congregation at all; but was ordained as a member of that "College of Divines," (so our statutes express it,) "founded to overturn all heresies, and defend the Catholic Faith." 3. For many years after I was ordained Priest, this limitation was never heard of. I heard not one syllable of it, by way of objection, to my preaching up and down, in Oxford or London, or the parts adjacent, in Gloucestershire, or Worcestershire; in Lancashire, Yorkshire, or Lincolnshire. Nor did the strictest disciplinarian scruple suffering me to exercise those powers wherever I came. 4. And, in fact, Is it not universally allowed, that every Priest, as such, has a power, in virtue of his ordination, either to preach or administer the sacrament, in any congregation, wherever the Rector or Curate desires his assistance? Does not every one then see through this thin pretence?

10. "The Bishops and Universities indeed have power to grant licenses to Itinerants. But the Church has provided in that case; they are not to preach in any church (Canon 50) till they shew their licence." The Church has well provided in that case. But what has that case to do with the case of common Clergymen? Only so much as to shew, how grossly this Canon has been abused, at Islington in particular: where the Churchwardens were instructed to hinder, by main force, the Priest whom the Vicar himself had appointed, from preaching, and to quote this Canon; which, as you plainly shew, belongs to quite another thing.

In the note you add, "Mr. Wesley being asked, by what authority he preached, replied, By the authority of Jesus Christ, conveyed to me by the (now) Archbishop of Canterbury, when he laid his hands upon me and said, Take thou authority to preach the Gospel. In this reply he thought fit, for a plain reason, to leave out the latter part of the commission: for that would have shewn his reader, the restraint and limitation, under which the exercise of the power is granted." Nay, I did not print the latter part of the words, for a plainer reason, because I did not speak them. And I did not speak them then, because they did not come into my mind. Though probably if they had, I should not have spoken them: it being my only concern, to answer the question proposed, in as few words as I could.

But before those words, which you suppose to imply such a restraint, as would condemn all the Bishops and Clergy in the nation, were those spoken without any restraint or limitation at all, which I apprehend to convey an indelible character, "Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a Priest in the church of God, now committed unto thee, by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

You proceed, "In the same Journal he declares, That he looks upon all the world as his parish, and explains his

meaning as follows: 'In whatever part of it I am, I judge it meet, right, and my bounden duty, to declare unto all that are willing to hear, the glad tidings of salvation. This is the work which I know God hath called me to.'" Namely, by the laying on the hands of the Presbytery: which directs me how to obey that general command, "While we have time, let us do good unto all men."

11. You object farther, "That the Methodists do not observe the Rubric before the Communion Service; which directs, so many as desire to partake of the holy Communion, to signify their names to the Curate the day before." What Curate desires they should? Whenever any Minister will give but one week's notice of this, I undertake, all that have any relation to me, shall signify their names within the time appointed. You object also, that they break through the twenty-eighth Canon, which requires, "That if strangers come to any church from other parishes, they should be remitted to their own churches, there to receive the Communion with their neighbours."

But what if there be no Communion there? Then this Canon does not touch the case, nor does any one break it, by coming to another church purely because there is no Communion at his own. As to your next advice, "To have a greater regard to the rules and orders of the Church," I cannot, for I now regard them, next to the word of God. And as to your last, "To renounce communion with the Church," I dare not. Nay, but let them thrust us out. We will not leave the ship: if you cast us out of it, then our Lord will take us up.

12. To the same head may be referred the objection some time urged, by a friendly and candid man, viz. "That it was unlawful to use extemporary prayer, because there was a Canon against it." It was not quite clear to me, that the Canon he cited was against extemporary prayer. But supposing it were, my plain answer would be, "That Canon I dare not obey: because the law of man binds only so far as it is consistent with the word of God." The same person objected, my not obeying the bishops and governors of the

Church. I answer, I both do and will obey them, in whatsoever I can with a clear conscience. So that there is no just ground for that charge, that I despise either the Rules or the Governors of the Church. I obey them in all things where I do not apprehend there is some particular law of God to the contrary. Even in that case, I shew all the deference I can; I endeavour to act as inoffensively as possible: and am ready to submit to any penalty, which can by law be inflicted upon me. Would to God every Minister and member of the Church, were herein altogether as I am!

VII. 1. I have been considering the chief objections that have lately been urged against the Doctrines I teach. The main arguments brought against this manner of teaching, have been considered also. It remains to examine the most current objections, concerning the effects of this teaching. Many affirm, "That it does abundance of hurt; that it has had very bad effects; insomuch that if any good at all has been done, yet it bears no proportion to the evil."

But to come to particulars: "First then, you are disturbers of the public peace." What, do we either teach or raise sedition? Do we speak evil of the Ruler of our people? Or, do we stir them up against any of those that are put in authority under him? Do we directly or indirectly promote faction, mutiny, or rebellion? I have not found any man in his senses yet, that would affirm this. "But it is plain, peace is broke and disturbances do arise, in consequence of your preaching." I grant it. But what would you infer? Have you never read the Bible? Have you not read, that the Prince of Peace himself was, in this sense, a disturber of the public peace? When he came into Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. 10,) all the city was moved (σεσεισθη,) shaken as with an earthquake. And the disturbance arose higher and higher, till the whole multitude cried out together, "Away with him; crucify him, crucify him, and Pilate gave sentence it should be done." Such another disturber of the public peace, was that Stephen, even from

the time he began "disputing with the Libertines and Cyrenians, till the people stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city and stoned him." Such disturbers of the peace were all those ringleaders of the sect of the Nazarenes, (commonly called Apostles) who wherever they came, "turned the world upside down." And above all the rest, that Paul of Tarsus, who occasioned so much disturbance at Damascus, (Acts ix,) at Antioch of Pisidia, (chap. xiii,) at Iconium, (chap. xiv,) Lystra, (ver. 19,) at Philippi, (chap. xvi.) at Thessalonica, (chap. xvii.) and, particularly, at Ephesus. The consequence of his preaching there was, that "the whole city was filled with confusion." And "they all ran together with one accord, some crying one thing, some another: inasmuch that the greater part of them knew not wherefore they were come together."

2. And can we expect it to be any otherwise now? Although what we preach is the gospel of peace, yet if you will violently and illegally hinder our preaching, must not this create disturbance? But observe, the disturbance begins on your part. All is peace, till you raise that disturbance. And then you very modestly impute it to us, and lay your own riot at our door! But of all this, our Lord hath told us before. "Think not that I am come to send peace upon earth:" that this will be the immediate effect, wherever my gospel is preached with power. "I am not come to send peace, but a sword:" this (so far as the wisdom of God permits, by whom "the hairs of your head are all numbered") will be the first consequence of my coming, whenever my word turns sinners from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God.

I would wish all you who see this scripture fulfilled, by disturbance following the preaching the gospel, to remember the behaviour of that wise Magistrate at Ephesus on the like occasion. He did not lay the disturbance to the Preacher's charge, but beckoned to the multitude and said, "Ye men of Ephesus—Ye ought to be quiet, and to do nothing rashly. For ye have brought these men, who are

neither robbers of temples, nor yet blasphemers of your goddess:" (not convicted of any such notorious crime, as can at all excuse this lawless violence.) "But if Demetrius hath a matter against any, the law is open, and there are Deputies" (or Proconsuls, capable of hearing and deciding the cause) "let them implead one another. But if ye inquire any thing concerning other things, it shall be determined in a lawful assembly."

3. "But you create divisions in private families." Accidentally, we do. For instance, suppose an entire family to have the form, but not the power of godliness; or to have neither the form nor the power; in either case, they may in some sort agree together. But suppose, when these hear the plain word of God, one or two of them are convinced, "This is the truth. And I have been all this time in the broad way that leadeth to destruction:" these then will begin to mourn after God; while the rest remain as they were. Will they not therefore of consequence divide, and form themselves into separate parties? Must it not be so in the very nature of things? And how exactly does this agree with the words of our Lord! "Suppose ye that I came to send peace upon earth? I tell you nay: but rather division. For from henceforth there shall be five divided in one house, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father: the mother against her daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law." (Luke xii. 51, 52, 53.) "And the foes of a man, shall be they of his own household." (Matt. x. 36.)

Thus it was from the very beginning. For is it to be supposed, that a heathen parent, would long endure a christian child? Or that a heathen husband would agree with a christian wife? Unless either the believing wife could gain her husband; or the unbelieving husband prevailed on the wife to renounce her way of worshipping God: at least, unless she would obey him in going no

more to those Societies or Conventicles, (εταιριας,) as they termed the Christian Assemblies.

4. Do you think now, I have an eye to your case? Doubtless I have; for I do not fight as one that beateth the air. "Why, have not I a right to hinder my own wife or child, from going to a Conventicle? And is it not the duty of wives to obey their husbands? And of children to obey their parents?" Only set the case seventeen hundred years back, and your own conscience gives you the answer. What would St. Paul have said to one whose husband forbad her to follow this way any more? What direction would our Saviour have given to him whose father enjoined him, not to hear the gospel? His words are extant still, "He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me." (Matt. x. 37, 38.) Nay more, "If any man cometh to me, and hateth not," (in comparison of me,) "his father and mother, and wife and children, yea, and his own life, he cannot be my disciple." (Luke xiv. 26.)

"O, but this is not a parallel case. For they were Heathens; but I am a Christian." A Christian! Are you so? Do you understand the word? Do you know what a Christian is? If you are a Christian, you have the mind that was in Christ; and you so walk as he also walked. You are holy as he is holy both in heart, and in all manner of conversation. Have you then the mind that was in Christ? And do you walk as Christ walked? Are you inwardly and outwardly holy? I fear, not even outwardly. No; you live in known sin. Alas! How then are you a Christian? What a railer, a Christian! A common swearer, a Christian! A sabbath-breaker, a Christian! A drunkard or whoremonger, a Christian! Thou art a Heathen barefaced; the wrath of God is on thy head, and the curse of God upon thy back. Thy damnation slumbereth not. By reason of such Christians it is that the holy name of Christ is blasphemed. Such as thou they are, that cause the very savages in the Indian woods to cry out, "Christian much

drunk, Christian beat men, Christian tell lies! Devil-Christian! Me no Christian!"

And so thou wilt direct thy wife and children in the way of salvation!——Woe unto thee, thou Devil-Christian! Woe unto thee, thou blind leader of the blind! What wilt thou make them? Two-fold more the children of hell than thyself?—Be ashamed. Blush, if thou canst blush. Hide thy face. Lay thee in the dust. Out of the deep cry unto God, if haply he may hear thy voice. Instantly smite upon thy breast. Who knoweth but God may take thee out of the belly of hell?

5. "But you are not one of these. You fear God, and labour to have a conscience void of offence. And it is from a principle of conscience, that you restrain your wife or children from hearing false doctrine." But how do you know it is false doctrine? Have you heard for yourself! Or, if you have not heard, have you carefully read what we have occasionally answered for ourselves? A man of conscience cannot condemn any one unheard. This is not common humanity. Nor will he refrain from hearing what may be the truth, for no better reason than fear of his reputation. Pray observe: I do not say, every man (or any man) is obliged in conscience to hear us. But I do say, every man in England who condemns us, is obliged to hear us first. This is only common justice, such as is not denied to a thief or a murderer. Take your choice therefore. Either hear us, or condemn us not. Either speak nothing at all, or hear before you speak.

But suppose you have both read and heard more than you liked: Did you read and hear fairly? Were not you loaded with prejudice? Did you not read or hear, expecting no good; perhaps desiring to find fault? If so, what wonder you judge as you do? What a poor mock-trial is this? You had decided the cause in your own breast, before you heard one word of the evidence. And still do you talk of acting out of conscience? Yea, a conscience void of offence?

We will put the case farther yet. Suppose your censure

was just, and this was actually false doctrine. Still every one must give an account of himself to God: and you cannot force the conscience of any one. You cannot compel another to see as you see. You ought not to attempt it. Reason and persuasion are the only weapons you ought to use, even toward your own wife and children. Nay, and it is impossible to starve them into conviction, or to beat even truth into their head. You may destroy them, in this way, but cannot convert them. Remember what our own Poet has said,

"By force beasts act, and are by force restrain'd;
The human mind by gentle means is gain'd.
Thou canst not take, what I refuse to yield:
Nor reap the harvest, tho' thou spoil'st the field."

6. Every reasonable man is convinced of this. And perhaps you do not concern yourself so much about the doctrine, but the mischief that is done. "How many poor families are starved, ruined, brought to beggary!" By what? Not by contributing a penny a week (the usual contribution in our Societies) and letting that alone, when they please, when there is any shadow of reason to suppose they cannot afford it. You will not say, any are brought to beggary by this. Not by gifts to me: for I receive none; save (sometimes) the food I eat. And public collections are nothing to me. That it may evidently appear they are not, when any such collection is made, to clothe the poor, or for any other determinate purpose, the money is both received and expended before many witnesses, without ever going through my hands at all. And then likewise all possible regard is had, to the circumstances of those who contribute any thing. And they are told over and over, if there be a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath.

But where are all these families that have been brought to beggary? How is it that none of them is forth coming? Are they all out of town? Then indeed I am in no danger of clearing myself from their indictment. It is the easiest thing of a thousand, for one at Newcastle to say, that I

have beggared him and all his kindred. If one of the long-bearded men on Tyne-bridge, were to say so just now, I could not readily confute him. But why will not you bring a few of these to tell me so to my face? I have not found one that would do this yet. They pray you would have them excused.

I remember a man coming to me with a doleful countenance, putting himself into many lamentable postures, gaping as wide as he could, and pointing to his mouth, as who would say, "he could not speak." I inquired of his companion what was the matter? And was informed, "he had fallen into the hands of Turks, who had used him in a barbarous manner, and cut out his tongue by the roots." I believed him. But when the man had a cheerful cup, he could find his tongue as well as another. I reflected, how is it that I could so readily believe that tale? The answer was easy, "Because it was told of a Turk." My friend, take knowledge of your own case. If you had not first took me for a Turk, or something equally bad, you could not so readily have believed that tale!

7. "But can it be, that there is no ground at all for a report, which is in every one's mouth?" I will simply tell you, all the ground which I can conceive. I believe many of those who attend on my ministry, have less of this world's goods than they had before, or at least, might have had, if they did not attend it. This fact I allow; and it may be easily accounted for, in one or other of the following ways.

First, I frequently preach on such texts as these: "Having food and raiment, let us be content therewith." "They who desire to be richfallinto temptation and a snare, and many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where the rust and moth doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither rust nor moth doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal." Now should any of those who are labouring by all possible means, *to lay up treasure upon earth*, feel

these words, they would not *enlarge their desires as hell;* but be *content with such things as they had.* They then probably might not heap up so much for their heirs, as otherwise they would have done. These would therefore have less than if they had not heard me: because they would grasp at less. Secondly, Wherever the gospel takes effect, *the foes of a man will be those of his own household.* By this means then some who hear and receive it with joy, will be poorer than they were before. Their domestic foes will, in many cases, hinder, embroil, and disturb the course of their affairs. And their relations, who assisted them before, or promised at least so to do, will probably withdraw or deny that assistance, unless they will be advised by them. Perhaps their nearest relations: it being no new thing for parents to disown their children, if "after the way which they call heresy, these worship the God of their fathers." Hence therefore some have less of this world's goods than they had in times past, either because they earn less, or because they receive less from them on whom they depend.

Thirdly, It is written, that "Those who received not the mark of the beast, either on their foreheads, or in their right hands," either openly or secretly, were not permitted to buy or sell any more. Now whatever the mystery contained herein may be, I apprehend the plain mark of the beast is wickedness; inward and outward unholiness, whatever is secretly or openly contrary to justice, mercy, or truth. And certain it is, the time is well nigh come, when those who have not this mark, can neither buy nor sell, can scarce follow any profession, so as to gain a subsistence thereby. Therefore, many of those who attend on my ministry, are by this means poorer than before. They will not receive the mark of the beast, either on their forehead or in their hand: or if they had received it before, they rid themselves of it as soon as possible. Some cannot follow their former way of life at all; (as pawnbrokers, smugglers, buyers or sellers of uncustomed goods) others cannot follow it as they did before. For they cannot oppress, cheat,

or defraud their neighbour: they cannot lie, or say what they do not mean; they must now speak the truth from their heart. On all these accounts, they have less of this world's goods; because they gain less than they did before.

Fourthly, *All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution:* if in no other way, yet at least in this, that *men will by revilings persecute them; and say all manner of evil against them falsely, for his sake.* One unavoidable effect of this will be, that men whose subsistence depends on their daily labour, will be often in want, for few will care to employ those of so bad a character. And even those who did employ them before, perhaps for many years, will employ them no more: so that hereby some may be brought to beggary.

8. What does this touch you? Are you one of those, "who will have nothing to do with those scandalous wretches?" Perhaps you will say, "And who can blame me for it: may I not employ whom I please?" We will weigh this. You employed *A. B.* for several years. By your own account, he was an honest, diligent man. You had no objection to him but his following this way. For this reason you turn him off. In a short time, having spent his little all, and having no supply, he wants bread. So does his family too as well as himself. Before he can get into other business to procure it, through want of convenient food to eat, and raiment to put on, he sickens and dies. This is not an imaginary scene. I have known the case: though too late to remedy it. "And what then?" Why then you are a murderer. *O earth, cover not thou his blood!* No, it doth not. *The cry thereof hath entered into the ears of the Lord God of Sabaoth.* And God requireth it at your hands: and will require it in an hour when you think not. For you have as effectually murdered that man, as if you had stabbed him to the heart. It is not I then who ruin and starve that family; it is you; you who call yourself a *Protestant!* You who cry out against the persecuting spirit of the *Papists!* Ye fools and blind! What are ye better than they? Why, Edmund Bonner

would have starved the hereticks in prison: whereas ye starve them in their own houses. And all this time you talk of liberty of conscience; yes, liberty for such a conscience as your own; a conscience past feeling; (for sure it had some once;) a conscience, seared with a hot iron. Liberty to serve the devil, according to your poor, hardened conscience, you allow; but not liberty to serve God. Nay, and what marvel? Whosoever thou art that readest this, and feelest in thy heart a real desire to serve God, I warn thee, expect no liberty for thy conscience, from him that hath no conscience at all. All ungodly, unthankful, unholy men; all villains of whatever denomination, will have liberty indeed all the world over, as long as their master is god of this world. But expect not liberty to worship God in spirit and in truth, to practise pure and undefiled religion (unless the Lord should work a new thing in the earth) from any but those who themselves love and serve God.

9. "However, it is plain, you make men idle. And this tends to beggar their families." This objection having been continually urged for some years, I will trace it from the foundation.

Two or three years after my return from America, one Captain Robert Williams of Bristol, made affidavit before the (then) Mayor of the city, that "it was a common report in Georgia, Mr. Wesley took people off from their work, and made them idle by preaching so much." The fact stood thus: at my first coming to Savannah, the generality of the people rose at seven or eight in the morning. And that part of them who were accustomed to work, usually worked till six in the evening. A few of them sometimes worked till seven; which is the time of sun-set there at Midsummer. I immediately began reading prayers and expounding the second lesson, both in the morning and evening. The morning service began at five, and ended at or before six: the evening service began at seven. Now supposing all the grown persons in the town, had been present every morning and evening, would this have made them

idle? Would they hereby have had less, or considerably more time for working?

10. The same rule I follow now, both at London, Bristol, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne: concluding the service at every place, winter and summer, before six in the morning: and not ordinarily beginning to preach, till near seven in the evening. Now do you, who make this objection, work longer through the year, than from six to six? Do you desire that the generality of people should? Or can you count them idle, that work so long? Some few are indeed accustomed to work longer. These I advise not to come on week-days. And it is apparent, that they take this advice, unless on some rare and extraordinary occasion. But I hope, none of you who turn them out of their employments, have the confidence to talk of my making them idle! Do you (as the homely phrase is) cry wh— first? I admire your cunning, but not your modesty. So far am I from either causing or encouraging idleness, that an idle person known to be such, is not suffered to remain in any of our societies: we drive him out as we would a thief or a murderer. "To shew all possible diligence," (as well as frugality) is one of our standing rules: and one, concerning the observance of which, we continually make the strictest inquiry.

11. "But you drive them out of their senses. You make them mad." Nay, then they are idle with a vengeance. This objection therefore being of the utmost importance, deserves our deepest consideration. And first, I grant, it is my earnest desire to drive all the world, into what you probably call *madness*: (I mean, inward religion) to make them just as mad as Paul was when he was so accounted by Festus. The counting all things on earth but dung and dross, so we may win Christ; the trampling under foot all the pleasures of the world, the seeking no treasure but in heaven; the having no desire of the praise of men, a good character, a fair reputation; the being exceedingly glad when men revile us and persecute us, and say all manner of evil against us falsely; the giving God thanks when our

father or mother forsakes us, when we have neither food to eat, nor raiment to put on, nor a friend but what shoots out bitter words, nor a place where to lay our head: this is utter distraction in your account: but in God's it is sober, rational religion: the genuine fruit, not of a distempered brain, not of a sickly imagination, but of the power of God in the heart, of victorious love, and of a sound mind.

12. I grant, secondly, it is my endeavour to drive all I can, into what you term another species of madness, which is usually preparatory to this, and which I term repentance or conviction. I cannot describe this better than a writer of our own has done. I will therefore transcribe his words. "When men feel in themselves the heavy burden of sin, see damnation to be the reward of it, and behold with the eye of their mind the horror of hell; they tremble, they quake, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, and cannot but accuse themselves, and open their grief unto Almighty God, and call unto him for mercy. This being done seriously, their mind is so occupied, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that all desire of meat and drink is laid apart, and loathsomeness (or loathing) of all worldly things and pleasure, cometh in place. So that nothing then liketh them, more than to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour of body to shew themselves weary of life."

Now what if your wife, or daughter, or acquaintance, after hearing one of these field-preachers, should come and tell you, that they saw damnation before them, and behold with the eye of their mind the horror of hell? What if they should tremble and quake, and be so taken up, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, as to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour to shew themselves weary of life: would you scruple to say, that they were stark mad? that these fellows had driven them out of their senses? and that whatever writer it

was, that talked at this rate, he was fitter for Bedlam than any other place?

You have overshot yourself now to some purpose. These are the very words of our own Church. You may read them, if you are so inclined, in the first part of the *Homily on Fasting*. And, consequently, what you have peremptorily determined to be mere lunacy and distraction, is that repentance unto life, which in the judgment both of the Church and of St. Paul, is "never to be repented of."

13. I grant, thirdly, that extraordinary circumstances have attended this conviction in some instances. A particular account of these I have frequently given. While the word of God was preached, some persons have dropped down as dead; some have been, as it were, in strong convulsions; some have roared aloud, though not with an articulate voice; and others spoke the anguish of their souls. This, I suppose, you believe to be perfect madness. But it is easily accounted for, either on principles of Reason or Scripture.

First, on principles of Reason. For how easy is it to suppose, that a strong, lively and sudden apprehension of the heinousness of sin, the wrath of God, and the bitter pains of eternal death, should affect the body as well as the soul, during the present laws of vital union: should interrupt or disturb the ordinary circulations, and put nature out of its course? Yea, we may question, whether while this union subsists, it be possible for the mind to be affected, in so violent a degree, without some or other of those bodily symptoms following? It is likewise easy to account for these things, on principles of Scripture. For when we take a view of them in this light, we are to add to the consideration of natural causes, the agency of those spirits who still excel in strength, and as far as they have leave from God, will not fail to torment whom they cannot destroy; to tear those that are coming to Christ. It is also remarkable, that there is plain Scripture-precedent of every symptom which has lately appeared. So that we cannot

allow even the conviction attended with these to be madness, without giving up both Reason and Scripture.

14. I grant, fourthly, That touches of extravagance, bordering on madness, may sometimes attend severe conviction. And this also is easy to be accounted for, by the present laws of the animal economy. For we know, fear or grief, from a temporal cause, may occasion a fever, and thereby a delirium. It is not strange then that some, while under strong impressions of grief or fear, from a sense of the wrath of God, should for a season forget almost all things else, and scarce be able to answer a common question: that some should fancy they see the flames of hell, or the devil and his angels around them: or that others, for a space, should be afraid, like Cain, *whosoever meeteth me will slay me.* All these, and whatever less common effects may sometimes accompany this conviction, are easily known from the natural distemper of madness, were it only by this one circumstance, that whenever the person convinced tastes the pardoning love of God, they all vanish away in a moment.

Lastly, I have seen one instance, (I pray God I may see no more such!) of real, lasting madness. Two or three years since, I took one with me to Bristol, who was under deep convictions; but of as sound an understanding in all respects, as ever he had been in his life. I went a short journey, and when I came to Bristol again, found him really distracted. I inquired particularly, at what time and place and in what manner this disorder began? And I believe there are, at least, threescore witnesses, alive and ready to testify what follows. When I went from Bristol, he contracted an acquaintance with some persons, who were not of the same judgment with me. He was soon prejudiced against me: quickly after, when our society were met together in Kingswood-house, he began a vehement invective both against my person and doctrines. In the midst of this, he was struck raving mad. And so he continued till

his friends put him into Bedlam: and probably laid his madness too to my charge.

15. I fear there may also be some instances of real madness, proceeding from a different cause. Suppose, for instance, a person hearing me, is strongly convinced, that a liar cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. He comes home, and relates this to his parents or friends, and appears to be very uneasy. These good Christians are disturbed at this, and afraid he is running mad too. They are resolved he shall never hear any of those fellows more; and keep to it in spite of all his intreaties. They will not suffer him when at home, to be alone, for fear he should read or pray. And perhaps in awhile they will constrain him, at least, by repeated importunities, to do again the very thing, for which he was convinced the wrath of God cometh upon the children of disobedience. What is the event of this? Sometimes the Spirit of God is quenched and departs from him. Now you have carried the point. The man is easy as ever, and sins on without any remorse. But in other instances, where those convictions sink deep, and the arrows of the Almighty stick fast in the soul, you will drive that person into real, settled madness, before you can quench the Spirit of God. I am afraid, there have been several instances of this. You have forced the man's conscience, till he is stark mad. But then, pray do not impute that madness to me. Had you left him to my direction, or rather to the direction of the Spirit of God, he would have been filled with love and a sound mind. But you have taken the matter out of God's hand. And now you have brought it to a fair conclusion!

16. How frequent this case may be, I know not. But doubtless most of those who make this objection, of our driving men mad, have never met with such an instance in their lives. The common cry is occasioned, either by those who are convinced of sin, or those who are inwardly converted to God: mere madness both (as was observed before) to those who are without God in the world. Yet I do not deny, but you may have seen one in Bedlam, who

said he had followed me. But observe, a madman's saying this, is no proof of the fact: nay, and if he really had, it should be farther considered, that his being in Bedlam, is no sure proof of his being mad. Witness the well-known case of Mr. Periam; and I doubt more such are to be found. Yea, it is well if some have not been sent thither, for no other reason, but because they followed me; their kind relations either concluding, that they must be distracted before they could do this: or, perhaps hoping, that Bedlam would make them mad, if it did not find them so.

17. And it must be owned, a confinement of such a sort, is as fit to cause as to cure distraction. For what scene of distress is to be compared to it? To be separated at once from all who are near and dear to you: to be cut off from all reasonable conversation, to be secluded from all business, from all reading, from every innocent entertainment of the mind, which is left to prey wholly upon itself, and day and night to pore over your misfortunes: to be shut up day by day in a gloomy cell, with only the walls to employ your heavy eyes, in the midst either of melancholy silence, or horrid cries, groans and laughter intermixed: to be forced by the main strength of those

"Who laugh at human nature and compassion,"

to take drenches of nauseous, perhaps torturing medicines, which you know you have no need of now, but know not how soon you may, possibly by the operation of these very drugs on a weak or tender constitution: here is distress! It is an astonishing thing, a signal proof of the power of God, if any creature who has his senses when that confinement begins, does not lose them, before it is at an end!

How must it heighten the distress, if such a poor wretch, being deeply convinced of sin, and growing worse and worse (as he probably will, seeing there is no medicine here for his sickness, no such Physician as his case requires) be soon placed among the incurables! Can imagination itself paint such a hell upon earth? Where even "Hope never comes, that comes to all!"——For what remedy?

If a man of sense and humanity, should happen to visit that house of woe, would he give the hearing to a madman's tale! Or if he did, would he credit it? "Do we not know, might he say, how well any of these will talk in their lucid intervals?" So that a thousand to one he would concern himself no more about it, but leave the weary to wait for rest in the grave!

18. I have now answered most of the current objections, particularly such as have appeared of weight to religious or reasonable men. I have endeavoured to shew, First, That the doctrines I teach are no other than the great truths of the gospel. Secondly, That though I teach them, not as I would, but as I can, yet it is in a manner not contrary to law: and, Thirdly, That the effects of thus preaching the gospel, have not been such as was weakly or wickedly reported: those reports being mere artifices of the devil, to hinder the work of God. Whosoever therefore ye are, who look for God to "revive his work in the midst of the years," cry aloud that he may finish it nevertheless, may "cut it short in righteousness." Cry to Messiah the Prince, that he may soon end the transgression, that he may lift up his standard upon earth, sending by whom he will send, and working his own work, when he pleaseth, and as he pleaseth, till "all the kindreds of the people worship before him," and the earth be "full of the knowledge of the glory of the LORD!"

December 22, 1744.

A

FARTHER APPEAL

TO MEN OF

REASON AND RELIGION.

PART II.

Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy Voice like a Trumpet, and shew my People their Transgression, and the House of Jacob their Sins. Isaiah lviii. 1.

I. 1. IT is not my present design to touch on any particular opinions, whether they are right or wrong: nor on any of those smaller points of practice, which are variously held by men of different persuasions: but first, to point out some things which on common principles are condemned by men of every denomination, and yet found in all: and, secondly, some wherein those of each denomination, are more particularly inconsistent with their own principles. And, first, it is my design, abstracting from opinions of every kind, as well as from disputable points of practice, to mention such of those things as occur to my mind, which are on common principles condemned, and notwithstanding found, more or less, among men of every denomination.

2. But before I enter on this unpleasing task, I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, by whatever love you bear to God, to your country, to your own souls; do not consider who speaks, but what is spoken. If it be possible, for one hour, lay prejudice aside; give what is advanced a fair hearing. Consider simply on each head, is this true, or is it false? Is it reasonable, or is it not? If you ask, "But

in whose judgment? I answer, In your own; I appeal to the light of your own mind. Is there not a faithful witness in your own breast? By this you must stand or fall. You cannot be judged by another man's conscience. Judge for yourself by the best light you have. And the merciful God teach me and thee whatsoever we know not!

Now, as I speak chiefly to those who believe the Scriptures, the method I propose is this: First, to observe what account is given therein of the Jews, the ancient church of God, inasmuch as all these things were written for our instruction, who say, we are now the visible church of the God of Israel. Secondly, To appeal to all who profess to be members thereof, to every one who is called a Christian, How far, in each instance, the parallel holds? And how much we are better than they?

3. First, I am to observe what account the Scriptures give of the Jews, the ancient church of God. I mean, with regard to their moral character; their tempers and outward behaviour.

No sooner were they brought out of Egypt, than we find them murmuring against God, (Exod. xiv. 12.) Again, when he had just brought them through the Red Sea with a mighty hand and a stretched out arm, (c. xv. 24.) And yet again, quickly after, in the wilderness of Zin, "your murmurings (saith Moses) are not against us, but against the Lord," (c. xvi. 8.) Nay, even while he was giving them bread from heaven, they were still murmuring and tempting God, (c. xviii. 2, 3.) and their amazing language at that season was, *Is the Lord among us, or not?* (c. xvii. 4.) The same spirit they shewed, during the whole forty years that he bore their manners in the wilderness: a solemn testimony whereof, Moses spake in the ears of all the congregation of Israel, when God was about to take him away from their head: "They have corrupted themselves, (saith he,) their spot was not of his children: they are a perverse and crooked generation. The Lord led Jacob about; he instructed him; he kept him as the apple of his eye," (Deut. xxxii. 5, 10.) "He made him ride on the high places of the

earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields: then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation," (c. v. 11, 13, 15.) In like manner God complains long after this, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth! I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib: but Israel doth not know, my people do not consider. Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers, children that are corrupters, they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel," (Isa. i. 2, 3, 4.) "Can a maid forget her ornaments, and a bride her attire? Yet my people have forgotten me, days without number," (Jer. ii. 32.)

4. And as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, so they had small regard to the ordinances of God. "Even from the days of your fathers, (said God by his prophets,) ye are gone away from my ordinances, and have not kept them," (Mal. iii. 7.) "Ye have said, It is in vain to serve God; and what profit is it that we have kept his ordinances?" (v. 14.) "Thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob, but thou hast been weary of me, O Israel: thou hast not brought me my burnt-offerings, neither hast thou honoured me with thy sacrifices," (Isa. xliv. 22, 23.) And so the prophet himself confesses, "Thou meetest those that remember Thee in thy ways—But there is none that calleth upon thy name, that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee," (Isa. lxiv. 5, 7.)

6. But they called upon his name by vain oaths, by perjury and blasphemy. So Jeremiah, "Because of swearing the land mourneth," (c. xxiii. 10.) "And though they say, The Lord liveth, surely they swear falsely," (c. v. 2.) So Hosea, "They have spoken words, swearing falsely in making a covenant." So Ezekiel, "They say the Lord seeth us not, the Lord hath forsaken the earth." So Isaiah, "Their tongue and their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of his glory," (c. iii. 8.) They say, "Let him make speed and hasten his work, that we may see it,

and let the counsel of the Holy One draw nigh and come, that we may know it," (c. v. 19.) And so Malachi, "Ye have wearied the Lord with your words; ye say, every one that doeth evil, is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; and, where is the God of judgment?" c. ii. 17.

6. And as they *despised his holy things*, so they *profaned his sabbaths*, (Ezek. xxii. 8.) Yea, when God sent unto them, saying, "Take heed unto yourselves, and bear no burden on the sabbath day, neither do ye any work, but hallow ye the sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers:—yet they obeyed not, neither inclined their ear, but made their neck stiff, that they might not hear, nor receive instruction," (Jer. xvii. 21, 22, 23.) Neither did they honour their parents, or those whom God, from time to time, appointed to be rulers over them. "In thee (in Jerusalem, said the prophet) they have set light by father and mother," (Ezek. xxii. 7.) And from the very day when God brought them up out of the land of Egypt, their murmurings, chiding, rebellion, and disobedience, against those whom he had chosen to go before them, make the most considerable part of their history. So that had not Moses stood in the gap, he had even destroyed them from the face of the earth.

7. How much more did they afterwards provoke God, by drunkenness, sloth, and luxury! "They have erred thro' wine, (saith the prophet Isaiah,) and through strong drink they are gone out of the way;" (c. xxviii. 7.) which occasioned those vehement and repeated warnings, against that reigning sin; "Woe to the drunkards of Ephraim, them that are overcome with wine," (ver. 1.) "The drunkards of Ephraim shall be trodden under foot," (v. 3.) "Woe unto them that rise up early that they may follow strong drink; that continue until night, till wine inflame them.—But they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of his hands," (c. v. 11, 12.) "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink, (v. 22.) "Woe to them that are at ease in Zion,—that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their

couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock, and their calves out of the midst of the stall, that chant to the sound of the viol, and invent to themselves instruments of music,—that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief ointments; but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph," (Amos vi. 1, 4, 5, 6.) "Behold, this (saith Ezekiel to Jerusalem) was the iniquity of thy sister Sodom: fulness of bread and abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughters," c. xvi. 49.

8. From sloth and fulness of bread, lewdness naturally followed. It was even while Moses was with them, that the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab: yea, of the daughters of Zion, Isaiah complains, "they walk with stretched-forth necks and wanton eyes," (c. iii. 16.) And of his people in general God complains by Jeremiah, "When I had fed them to the full, they assembled themselves by troops in the harlot's house. They were as fed horses in the morning, every one neighed after his neighbour's wife," (c. v. 7, 8.) "They be all adulterers, an assembly of treacherous men," (c. ix. 2.) "The land is full of adulterers," (c. xxiii. 10.) Yea, and some of them were given up to unnatural lusts. Thus we read, Judges xix. 22, "The men of Gibeah beset the house, wherein the stranger was, and beat at the door, and spake to the master of the house, saying, bring forth the man that came into thine house, that we may know him." And there were also long after, Sodomites in the land, in the days of Rehoboam and of the following kings: "The very shew of whose countenance witnessed against them, and they declared their sin as Sodom, they hid it not," Isa. iii. 9.

9. This was accompanied with injustice in all its forms. Thus all the prophets testify against them, "The Lord looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry," (Isa. v. 7.) "Thou hast taken usury and increase; thou hast greedily gained of thy neighbour by extortion.—Behold, I have smitten my hand, at thy dishonest gain which thou hast made," (Ezek. xxii. 12, 13.) "The balances of deceit are in Jacob's hand; he loveth

to oppress," (Hos. xii. 7.) "Are there not yet the scant measure that is abominable; the wicked balances, and the bag of deceitful weights?" (Micah vi. 10, 11.) "He that departeth from evil, maketh himself a prey," (Isa. lix. 15.) "And the Lord saw it, and it displeased him that there was no judgment." "The wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he. They take up all of them with the angle, they catch them in their net, and gather them in their drag," (Hab. i. 13, 14, 15.) "They covet fields, and take them by violence, and houses, and take them away," (Mic. ii. 2.) "They pull off the robe with the garment, from them that pass by securely," (v. 8.) "They have dealt by oppression with the stranger; they have vexed the fatherless and the widow," (Ezek. xxii. 7.) "The people of the land have used oppression, and exercised robbery; and have vexed the poor and needy, yea, they have oppressed the stranger wrongfully," (v. 29.) "Their works are works of iniquity, and the acts of violence are in their hands," (Isaiah lix. 6.) "Judgment is turned away backward, and justice standeth afar off; for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter," v. 14.

10. Truth indeed was fallen, as well as justice. "Every mouth (saith Isaiah) speaketh folly," (c. ix. 17.) "This is a rebellious people, lying children," (c. xxx. 9.) "Their lips have spoken lies, and muttered perverseness. None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth; they trust in vanity and speak lies," (c. lix. 3, 4.) This occasioned that caution of Jeremiah, "Take ye heed every one of his neighbour, and trust ye not in any brother; for every brother will utterly supplant, and every neighbour will walk with slanders. And they will deceive every one his neighbour, and will not speak the truth; they have taught their tongues to speak lies, and weary themselves to commit iniquity," c. ix. 4, 5.

11. And even those who abstained from these gross outward sins, were still inwardly corrupt and abominable. "The whole head was sick, and the whole heart was faint; yea, from the sole of the foot even unto the head, there was no soundness, but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying

sores," (Isa. i. 5, 6.) "All these nations (saith God) are uncircumcised: and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in heart," (Jer. ix. 26.) "Their heart is divided," (Hos. x. 2.) "They have set up their idols in their heart; they are all estranged from me through their idols," (Ezek. xiv. 3, 4.) Their soul still clave unto the dust. They laid up treasures upon earth. "From the least of them, (saith Jeremiah,) even unto the greatest, every one is given to covetousness," (c. vi. 13.) "They panted after the dust of the earth," (Amos ii. 7.) "They laded themselves with thick clay," (Hab. iii. 6.) "They joined house to house, and laid field to field, until there was no place," (Isa. v. 8.) "Yea, they enlarged their desires as hell: they were as death, and could not be satisfied," Hab. ii. 5.

12. And not only for their covetousness, but for their pride of heart were they an abomination to the Lord. "The pride of Israel (saith Hosea) doth testify to his face," (c. vii. 10.) "Hear ye, give ear, (saith Jeremiah,) be not proud—Give glory to the Lord your God," (c. xiii. 15.) "But they would not be reproved; they were still wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight," (Isa. v. 21.) and continually saying to their neighbour, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me; for I am holier than thou!" Isa. lxv. 5.

They added hypocrisy to their pride. "This people (saith God himself) draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their hearts far from me," (Isa. xxix. 13.) "They have not cried unto me with their hearts, when they howled upon their beds," (Hos. vii. 14.) "They return, but not to the Most High; they are like a deceitful bow," (v. 16.) "They did but flatter him with their mouth, and dissemble with him in their tongue," (Psal. lxxviii. 36.) So that herein they only "profaned the holiness of the Lord." "And this have ye done again, (saith Malachi,) covering the altar of the Lord with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, insomuch that he regarded not the offering any more," c. ii. 11, 13.

13. This God continually declared to those formal wor-

shippers; That their outside religion was but vain. "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices, saith the Lord? I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. Bring no more vain oblations: incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with it; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting.—When you spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear," (Isa. i. 11, 13, 15.) "He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck," (c. lxvi. 3.) "When they fast, I will not hear their cry; and when they offer an oblation, I will not accept it," (Jer. xiv. 12.) "Go ye, serve your idols, if ye will not hearken unto me; but pollute ye my holy Name no more with your gifts," Ezek. xx. 39.

14. Yet all this time they were utterly careless and secure; nay, confident of being in the favour of God. "They were at ease; they put far away the evil day," (Amos vi. 1, 3.) "Even when God hath poured his anger upon Israel, it set him on fire round about, yet he knew it not: it burned him, yet he laid it not to heart," (Isa. xlii. 25.) "A deceived heart had turned him aside, that he could not say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?" (c. xliv. 10.) So far from it, that at this very time they said, "We are innocent, we have not sinned," (Jer. ii. 35, 37.) "We are wise, and the law of the Lord is with us," (c. viii. 8.) "The temple of the Lord! the temple of the Lord are we," c. vii. 4.

15. Thus it was that they hardened themselves in their wickedness. "They are impudent children, saith God, and stiff-hearted," (Ezek. ii. 4.) "Were they ashamed when they had committed abomination? Nay, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush," (Jer. vi. 15.) "I have spread out my hand all the day to a rebellious people, that provoketh me to anger continually to my face," (Isa. lxv. 2, 3.) "They will not hearken unto me, saith the

Lord, for all the house of Israel are impudent and hard-hearted," (Ezek. iii. 7.) "Since the day that their fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day, I have sent unto them all my servants the prophets, rising up early and sending them: yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear, but hardened their neck; they did worse than their fathers," Jer. vi. 25, 26.

They were equally hardened against mercies and judgments. When he gave them rain, both the former and the latter in his season; when he reserved unto them the appointed weeks of the harvest, filling their hearts with food and gladness, still none of this revolting and rebellious people said, "Let us now fear the Lord our God," (Jer. v. 23, 24.) "Nor yet did they turn unto him when he smote them," (Isa. ix. 13.) "In that day did the Lord call to weeping and to mourning: and behold joy and gladness, eating flesh and drinking wine: let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we shall die," (c. xxii. 12, 13. "Although he consumed them, yet they refused to receive instruction; they made their faces harder than a rock—None repented him, but every one turned to his course, as a horse rusheth into the battle," (Jer. v. 3.; viii. 6.) "I have given you want of bread in all your places, yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. I have also with-holden the rain from you when there were yet three months unto the harvest.—I have smitten you with blasting and mildew; your gardens and your vineyards the palmer-worm devoured.—I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt; your young men have I slain with the sword.—I have overthrown some of you, as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and ye were as a fire-brand plucked out of the burning; yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord," Amos iv. 6—11.

16. In consequence of their resolution not to return, they would not endure sound doctrine, or those that spake it. They "said to the seers, see not, and to the prophets, prophesy not unto us right things—Speak unto us smooth things—Cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before

us," (Isa. xxx. 10, 11.) "But they hated him that rebuked in the gate, and they abhorred him that spake uprightly," (Amos v. 10.) "Accordingly, thy people (said God to Ezekiel) still are talking against thee, by the walls, and in the doors of the houses," (c. xxxiii. 30.) "And Amaziah the priest sent to Jeroboam, king of Israel, saying, Amos hath conspired against thee in the midst of the house of Israel; the land is not able to bear all his words. Also Amaziah said unto Amos, Go flee thee away into the land of Judah, and prophesy there. But prophesy not again any more at Bethel, for it is the king's chapel, and it is the king's court," (c. vii. 10, 12, 13.) From the same spirit it was that they said of Jeremiah, "Come, and let us devise devices against him—Come, and let us smite him with the tongue, and let us not give heed to any of his words," (c. xviii. 18.) Hence it was that he was constrained to cry out, "O Lord, I am in derision daily; every one mocketh me. Since I spake, the word of the Lord was made a reproach unto me, and a derision daily: for I heard the defaming of many, fear on every side: report, say they, and we will report it: all my familiars watched for my halting: saying, Peradventure he will be enticed, and we shall prevail against him, and we shall take our revenge on him," (c. xx. 7, 8, 10.) And elsewhere, "Woe is me, my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of strife, and a man of contention to the whole earth. I have neither lent on usury, nor men have lent to me on usury: yet every one of them doth curse me," c. xv. 10.

17. "But if a man walking in the spirit of falsehood, do lie, (said the prophet Micah,) saying, I will prophesy unto thee of wine and strong drink, he shall even be the prophet of this people," (c. ii. 11.) And God gave them pastors after their own hearts: such were those sons of "Eli, sons of Belial, who knew not the Lord," (1 Sam. ii. 12.) Rapacious, covetous, violent men, (ver. 14, 15, 16,) by reason of whom "men abhorred the offering of the Lord," (ver. 17,) who not only "made themselves vile," (c. iii. 13,) but also "made the Lord's people to transgress," (c. ii. 24,) while

they "made themselves fat with the chiefest of all the offerings of Israel," (v. 29.) Such were those of whom Isaiah says, "The priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink: they are swallowed up of wine," (c. xxviii. 7.) "Come ye, say they, I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink: and to-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant," (c. lvi. 12.) Therefore, saith he, "the Lord hath poured out upon you the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes: the prophets and the seers hath he covered; and the vision of all is become unto you, as the words of a book that is sealed," (c. xxix. 10, 11.) Such also were those of whom he saith, "His watchmen are blind, they are all ignorant; they are all dumb dogs; they cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Greedy dogs, which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand. They all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter," c. lvi. 10, 11.

Little better were those of whom the prophets that followed have left us so dreadful an account; "both prophet and priest are profane; yea, in my house have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord. And from the prophets of Jerusalem, is profaneness gone forth into all the land," (Jer. xxiii. 11, 15.) "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned my holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and the profane, and I am profaned among them," (Ezek. xxii. 26.) "If I be a father, where is mine honour; and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of Hosts unto you, O priests that despise my Name," Mal. i. 6.

Yea, some of them were fallen into the grossest sins. "The company of priests (said Hosea) commit lewdness: there is whoredom in Ephraim, Israel is despised," (c. vi. 9, 10.) "I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem (saith God by Jeremiah) a horrible thing: they commit adultery and walk in lies," c. xxiii. 14.

18. And those who were clear of this were deeply covetous. "Who is there among you that would shut the doors

for nought? Neither do ye kindle fire on my altar for nought. I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts," (Mal. vi. 10.) "The priests of Zion preach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money. Yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us?" (Mic. iii. 11.) "Thus saith the Lord, The prophets bite with their teeth, and cry peace: and he that putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare war against him," (c. iii. 5.) Therefore "the word of the Lord came unto Ezekiel, saying, Prophesy against the shepherds of Israel, and say, Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves: should not the shepherds feed the flocks? Ye eat the fat and ye clothe you with the wool; but ye feed not the flock. The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick; neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost, but with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them. And they were scattered because there is no shepherd, and they became meat to all the beasts of the field. Yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search and seek after them," c. xxxiv. 1—6.

19. To the same effect do the other prophets declare, "Ye are departed out of the way, ye have caused many to stumble.—Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people," (Mal. ii. 8, 9.) "From the prophet even unto the priest, every one dealeth falsely. They have healed also the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace, when there is no peace," (Jer. vi. 13, 14.) "They prophesy lies in my name," (c. xiv. 14.) "They say still unto them that despise me, the Lord hath said, ye shall have peace; and they say unto every man that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, No evil shall come upon you," (c. xxiii. 17.) "The prophets of Jerusalem strengthen the hands of the evil-doers, that none doth return from his wickedness," (v. 14.) "They have seduced my people, and one built up

a wall, and, lo! others daubed it with untempered mortar," (Ezek. xiii. 10.) "With lies they have made the hearts of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life," (v. 22.) "Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard, they have trodden my portion under foot; they have made my pleasant portion a desolate wilderness," (Jer. xxii. 10.) "There is a conspiracy of her prophets in the midst of her, like a roaring lion, ravening the prey. They have devoured souls," (Ezek. xxii. 25.) "Thus saith the Lord, feed the flock of the slaughter, whose possessors slay them, and hold themselves not guilty, and they that sell them, say, Blessed be the Lord, for I am rich; and their own shepherds pity them not," Zach. xi. 4, 5.

II. 1. Such is the general account which the Scriptures give of the Jews, the ancient church of God. And since all these things were *written for our instruction*, who are now the visible church of the God of Israel, I shall in the next place appeal to all who profess this, to every one who calls himself a *Christian*, how far in each instance the parallel holds, and how much *we* are better than *they*.

And, first, Were they *discontented?* Did they *repine* at the providence of God? Did they say, *Is the Lord among us or not?* when they were in imminent *danger*, or pressing *want*, and saw no way to escape? And which of us can say, *I am clear from this sin:* I have washed my hand and my heart in innocency? Have not we who *judge others, done the same things? murmured* and *repined* times without number? yea, and that when we were not in pressing *want*, nor distressed with imminent *danger?* Are we not in general, (our own writers being the judges,) have we not ever been from the earliest ages, a *repining, murmuring, discontented people*, never long satisfied either with God or man? Surely in this we have great need to humble ourselves before God; for we are in no wise better than they.

But "Jeshurun forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation." And did not England

too? Ask ye of the generations of old, inquire from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, whether there was ever a people called by his name, which had less of "God in all their thoughts?" Who in the whole tenor of their behaviour shewed so "light an esteem for the Rock of our salvation?"

Could there ever be a stronger cause for God to cry out, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth!" For hath he not "nourished and brought us up as his children?" "And yet, how have we rebelled against him!" If "Israel of old did not know God," if his ancient people "did not consider;" was this peculiar to them? Are not we also under the very same condemnation? Do we, as a people, know God? Do we consider him as God? Do we tremble at the presence of his power? Do we revere his excellent Majesty? Do we remember at all times, God is here? He is now reading my heart: he spieth out all my ways; there is not a word in my tongue but he knoweth it altogether: is this the character of us English Christians? The mark whereby we are known from the Heathen? Do we thus know God? Thus consider his power, his love, his all-seeing eye? Rather, are we not likewise a "sinful nation, who have forgotten him days without number! A people laden with iniquity, continually forsaking the Lord, and provoking the Holy One of Israel?"

2. There is indeed a wide difference in this respect between the Jews and us; they happened (if I may so speak) to forget God, because other things came in their way: but we design to forget him: we do it of set purpose, because we do not like to remember him. From the accounts given by Jeremiah, we have reason to believe, that when that people was most deeply corrupted, yet the greatest men in the nation, the ministers of state, the nobles and princes of Judah, talked of God sometimes, perhaps as frequently as upon any other subject. But is it so among us? Rather, is it not a point of good breeding to put God far away, out of their sight? Is he talked of at all among the great? The nobles, or ministers of state in England?

Among any persons of rank or figure in the world? Do they allow God any place in their conversation? From day to day, from year to year, do you discourse one hour of the wonders he doth for the children of men? If one at a gentleman or a nobleman's table were to begin a discourse, of the wisdom, greatness, or power of God, would it not occasion (at least) as much astonishment, as if he had began to talk blasphemy? And if the unbred man persisted therein, would it not put all the company into confusion? And what do you sincerely believe the more favourable part would say of him when he was gone? But that—"He is a little touched in his head!" or, "Poor man! he has not seen the world?"

You know, this is the naked truth. But how terrible is the thought to every serious mind! Into what a state is this *Christian* nation fallen! Nay, the men of eminence, of fortune, of education! Would not a thinking foreigner, who should be present at such an interview, be apt to conclude, that the men of quality in England were Atheists? That they did not believe there was any God at all; or, at best only an Epicurean God, who sat at ease upon the circle of the heavens, and did not concern himself about us worms of the earth? Nay, but he understands every thought now rising in your heart. And how long can you put him out of your sight? Only till this veil of flesh is rent in sunder. For your pomp will not then follow you. Will not your body be mingled with common dust? And your soul stand naked before God? O that you would now "acquaint yourself with God," that you may then be clothed with glory and immortality!

3. Did God complain of the Jews, "even from the days of your fathers ye are gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them?" And how justly may he make the same complaint of us! For how exceedingly small a proportion do we find of those in any place who call themselves Christians, that make a conscience of attending them! Does one third of the inhabitants in any one parish throughout this great city, constantly attend public prayer and the

ministry of his word, as of conscience towards God? Does one tenth of those who acknowledge it is an institution of Christ, duly attend the Lord's Supper? Does a fiftieth part of the nominal members of the Church of England observe the *Fasts* of the Church, or so much as the forty days of Lent, and all Fridays in the year? Who of these then can cast the first stone at the Jews, for neglecting the ordinances of God?

Nay, how many thousands are found among us, who have never partook of the Supper of the Lord! How many thousands are there, that live and die in this unrepented disobedience? What multitudes, even in this Christian city, do not attend any public worship at all! No, nor spend a single hour from one year to another in privately pouring out their hearts before God! Whether God "meeteth him that remembereth him in his ways" or not, is no concern of theirs: so the man eats and drinks, and "dies as a beast dieth," "drops into the dark and disappears." It was not therefore of the children of Israel alone, that the messenger of God might say, "There is none (comparatively) that calleth upon thy name, that stirreth himself up to take hold on Thee."

4. Ye have heard, that it was said to them of old times, "Because of swearing the land mourneth." But if this might be said of the land of Canaan, how much more of this land! In what city or town, in what market or exchange, in what street or place of public resort, is not the "holy name whereby we are called" taken in vain, day by day? From the noble to the peasant, who fails to call upon God, in this, if in no other way? Whither can you turn, where can you go, without hearing some praying to God for damnation, either on his neighbour or himself? Cursing those, without either fear or remorse, whom Christ hath bought to inherit a blessing!

Are you one of these stupid, senseless, shameless wretches, that call so earnestly for damnation on your own soul? What if God should take you at your word? Are you "able to dwell with everlasting burnings?" If you are,

should you be in haste to be in the "lake of fire burning with brimstone?" God help you, or you will be there soon enough, and long enough; for that "fire is not quenched!" But the "smoke thereof ascendeth up, day and night, for ever and ever!"

And what is that important affair, concerning which you were but now appealing to God? Were you "calling God to record upon your soul," touching your everlasting salvation? No; but touching the beauty of your horse, the swiftness of your dog, or the goodness of your drink! How is this? What notion have you of God? What do you take him to be?

Idcirco stolidam præbet tibi vellere barbam
Jupiter—?

What stupidity, what infatuation is this! Thus without either pleasure, or profit, or praise, to set at nought him that hath "all power both in heaven and earth!" Wantonly to "provoke the eyes of his glory!"

Are you a man of letters, who are sunk so low? I will not send you to the inspired writers, (so called: perhaps you disdain to receive instruction by them,) but to the old, blind heathen. Could you only fix in your mind the idea he had of God, (though it is not strictly just, unless we refer it to God made Man,) you would never thus affront him more,

Ἦ, και κυανεησιν επ' οφρυσι νευσε Κρονιων
Ἀμβροσιαι δ' αρα χαιται επερ' ῥωσαντο Ἄνακτος
Κρατος απ' αθανατοιο· μεγαν δ' ελελιξεν Ὄλυμπον.

Shall not the very heathen then "rise up in judgment against this generation, and condemn it? Yea, and not only the learned heathens of Greece and Rome, but the savages of America. For I never remember to have heard a wild Indian name the name of *Sootaleicatee*, (him that sitteth in heaven,) without either laying his hand upon his breast, or casting his eyes down to the ground. And you are a Christian! O how do you cause the very name of Christianity to be blasphemed among the heathen!

5. But is it light swearing only, (inexcusable as that is,)

because of which our land mourneth? May it not also be said of us, "Though they say the Lord liveth, surely they swear falsely?" Yea, to such a degree, that there is hardly the like in any nation under heaven; that almost every corner of the land is filled with wilful, deliberate perjury.

I speak not now of the perjuries which every common swearer cannot but run into day by day. And indeed common swearing notoriously contributes to the growth of perjury. For oaths are little minded when common use has sullied them, and every minute's repetition has made them cheap and vulgar. Nor of those which are continually committed and often detected in our open courts of justice. Only with regard to the latter I must remark, that they are a natural consequence of that monstrous, shocking manner, wherein oaths are usually administered therein: without any decency or seriousness at all; much less with that awful solemnity, which a rational heathen would expect, in an immediate appeal to the great God of heaven.

I had once designed to consider all the oaths which are customarily taken by any set of men among us. But I soon found this was a work too weighty for me: so almost *in infinitum* are oaths multiplied in England: I suppose to a degree which is not known in any other nation in Europe.

What I now propose is, to instance only in a few, (but those not of small importance,) and to shew, how amazingly little regard is had to what is solemnly promised or affirmed before God.

6. This is come, in part, to my hands by a late author. So far as he goes, I shall do little more than transcribe his words. Mr. Disney's *First Essay*, p. 30.

"When a Justice of the Peace is sworn into the commission, he makes oath—That he shall do equal right to the poor and to the rich, after his cunning, wit, and power, and after the laws and customs of the realm and statutes thereof made, in all articles in the king's commission to him directed.—What those articles are, you will find in the first *Assignavimus* of the Commission: 'We have assigned you

and every one of you, jointly and severally—to keep and cause to be kept, all ordinances and statutes, made for—the quiet, rule, and government of our people, in all and every the articles thereof, according to the force, form, and effect of the same, and to chastise and punish all persons, offending against any of them, according to the form of those statutes and ordinances.' So that he is solemnly sworn to the execution of all such statutes, as the legislative power of the nation has thought fit to throw upon his care. Such are all those (among others) made against *drunkenness, tipling, profane swearing, blasphemy; lewd and disorderly practices and profanation of the Lord's day.* And it is hard to imagine how a Justice of Peace can think himself more concerned, to suppress riots, or private quarrels, than he is to levy twelve pence on a profane swearer, five shillings on a drunkard, ten shillings on a public-house that suffers tipling, or any other penalty which the law exacts of vice and immorality. The same oath binds him both to the one and the other, laying an equal obligation upon his conscience. How a magistrate, who neglects to punish excess, profaneness, and impiety, can excuse himself from the guilt of perjury, I do not pretend to know. If he reason fairly, he will find himself as much forsworn, as an evidence who being upon his oath, to declare the whole truth, nevertheless conceals the most considerable part of it. And his perjury is so much the more infamous, as the ill example and effects of it will be mischievous."

7. The same author (in the preface to his second Essay) goes on:

"You, gentlemen of the *grand juries*, take a solemn oath, That you will diligently inquire, and true presentment make, of all such articles, matters, and things, as shall be given you in charge: as also, that you will (not only present no person for envy, hatred, or malice, but) not leave any unpresented, for fear, favour, or affection. Now, are not the laws against immorality and profaneness given you in charge, as well as those against riots, felony, and treason? Are not presentment and indictment one method expressly

appointed by the statutes, for the punishment of drunkenness and tipling? Are not the houses of bawdry and gaming, punishable in the same courts, and consequently presentable by you? Is not the proclamation for the punishing of vice, profaneness, and immorality, always read before you as soon as you are sworn? And does not the judge of assize, or chairman of the bench, in the charge given immediately after the reading of it, either recite to you the particular laws against such offences, or refer you for them to that proclamation? It is plain from all this, that you are bound upon your oaths, to present all vice and immorality, as well as other crimes, that fall within your knowledge, because they are expressly given you in charge. And this you are to do, not only when evidence is offered before you by the information of others, but with regard to all such offences as you or any of you are able of your own personal knowledge to present: all which you have sworn to do impartially, without fear, favour, or affection."

I leave it now with all reasonable men to consider, how few *grand juries* perform this? And consequently, what multitudes of them, throughout the nation, fall under the guilt of wilful perjury!

8. The author proceeds, p. 8, "I shall next address myself to you that are constables. And to you I must needs say, That if you know your duty, it is no thanks to us that are justices. For the oath we usually give you is so short, and in such general terms, that it leaves you no manner of instruction in the particulars of the office to which you are sworn. But that which ought to be given you, recites part of your duty in the following words:

"You shall do your best endeavour, that rogues, vagabonds, and night-walkers, be apprehended; and that the statutes made for their punishment, be duly put in execution: you shall have a watchful eye to such as shall keep any house or place where any unlawful game is used: as also to such as shall frequent such places, or shall use any unlawful games, there or elsewhere. You shall present all and every the offences contrary to the statutes made to re-

strain tipling in inns, alehouses, and other victualling houses, and for repressing of drunkenness. You shall once in the year, during your office, present all popish recusants. You shall well and duly execute all precepts and warrants to you directed. And you shall well and duly, according to your knowledge, power, and ability, do and execute all other things belonging to the office of a constable, so long as you shall continue therein."

Upon this, "I would observe first, That *actors of plays* are expressed by name within the statute, to be taken up for vagabonds, and punished accordingly; and that though a statute of queen Elizabeth excepts such companies as have a licence under the hand and seal of a nobleman, yet a later statute in the reign of king James I. has taken away that protection from them; by declaring, That from henceforth no authority to be given by any peer of the realm, shall be available to free or discharge them from the pains and punishments of that former statute. Every constable therefore in those parishes, where any of these *strolling players* come, is bound by his oath to seize upon, correct, and send them packing without delay."

"The next part of your oath obliges you to keep a watchful eye, on such houses as keep, and such persons as use unlawful gaming. The statute directs you weekly, or at least monthly, to search within your liberties, all houses or places suspected of this offence, and upon discovering, to bring them to punishment. Upon this article I would observe, 1. That the law makes some allowance, for artificers, husbandmen, apprentices, labourers, and servants, to play in Christmas, but at no other time of the year; and, 2. That all sports and pastimes whatsoever are made unlawful upon the Lord's day, by a statute of king Charles II. You are therefore bound upon oath, to bring to punishment such as are guilty of profaning that day by any sports or pastimes whatsoever.

"The following parts of your oath are, 1. That you shall present all and every the offences of tipling and drunkenness that come to your knowledge; 2. That you shall once

in the year present all popish recusants. Nay, and by the statutes on which your oath is grounded, you are obliged to present in session, all those within your parishes, who (not being Dissenters) come not once in a month, at least, to Church. And, 3. That you shall well and duly execute all precepts and warrants to you directed. I believe no constable will pretend to be ignorant of this. How is it then, that when we send out warrants, to levy on offenders for swearing, and drunkenness, and the like, those warrants are so ill obeyed? Are you not sworn to execute these as well as any other, and that duly too, according to the tenor of your precept? Your precept tells you, you shall demand such a sum, and if the offender will not pay, you shall levy it by distress of his goods: and if no distress can be taken, you are then only to set him in the stocks; otherwise you have no authority so to do: nor is the setting him in the stocks, when you might have distrained, any execution of your precept."

"The last part of your oath is in general terms, That you shall well and duly, according to your knowledge, power, and ability, do and execute all other things belonging to the office of a constable. I shall instance in some things which certainly belong to your office, because you, and none else, can do them. 1. A constable may, without a warrant, apprehend any persons, and carry them before a Justice, who are driving carts, horses, or cattle, on the Lord's day: 2. He may do the same, without a warrant, to such as he may find at sports or pastimes on that day: 3. To such as he shall find tippling in public houses: 4. Shopkeepers selling or exposing goods to sale on the Lord's day; and, lastly, to such as he shall find drunk or blaspheming, or profanely swearing or cursing.

"Thus have I shewn you, in part, what belongs to your office: it is well, if according to the tenor of your oath, you duly, to the best of your knowledge and ability, do and execute all these things. But remember, that, if you do not, if you neglect any of them, you are forsworn."

Now let all men judge, how many constables in England are clear of wilful perjury!

9. "I will now (he goes on) address myself to churchwardens. Your oath is, 'That you shall well and truly execute the office of a churchwarden, for the ensuing year; and to the best of your skill and knowledge, present such persons and things, as are presentable, by the ecclesiastical laws of this realm. I shall set down only a few of these.

"The statute of king James I. obliges you to present once a year, all monthly absenters from church. The 90th Canon enjoins you, first to admonish and then, if they reform not, to present all your parishioners who do not duly resort to church on Sundays, and there continue the whole time of divine service. On this article observe, 1. That a person's being absent from church, is ground sufficient for you to proceed. 2. That you are not only to present, those who do not come to church, but also those that behave irreverently or indecently there, either walking about or talking; all who do not abide there orderly and soberly, the whole time of service and sermon, and all that loiter away any part of that time in the churchyard or in the fields.'

"The 112th Canon enjoins you, within forty days after Easter, to exhibit to the Bishop or his chancellor, the names of all above the age of sixteen, within your parish that did not receive the Communion.'

"Other statutes oblige you to present drunkenness, tippling, and public houses suffering persons to tipple in them.'

"And the 109th Canon binds you to present all manner of vice, profaneness, and debauchery, requiring you faithfully to present all and every the offenders in adultery, whoredom, drunkenness, profane swearing, or any other uncleanness and wickedness of life." It is therefore a part of that office to which you are solemnly sworn, to prevent not only all drunkenness and tippling, but profane swearing, lewdness, and whatsoever else is contrary to Christian piety. So that if you know any of your parishioners, be

his quality or circumstances what they will, that is guilty of any of these, you are obliged to present him at the next visitation, or you are yourselves guilty of perjury. And the 26th Canon expresses such an abhorrence of a churchwarden's neglect in this matter, that it forbids the Minister, in any wise, to admit you to the holy communion, "who" (as the words of the Canon are) "having taken your oaths to present all such offences in your several parishes, shall notwithstanding your said oaths, either in neglecting or refusing to present, wittingly and willingly, desperately and irreligiously incur, the horrid guilt of perjury."

And who is clear? I appeal to every Minister of a parish, from one end of England to the other. How many churchwardens have you known, in twenty, thirty, forty years, who did not thus *desperately* and 'irreligiously incur, the horrid guilt of perjury?'

10. I proceed to perjuries of another kind. The Oath taken by all *Captains of ships*, every time they return from a trading voyage, runs in these terms:

"I do swear, that the entry above written, now tendered and subscribed by me, is a just report of the name of my ship, its burthen, built, property, number, and country mariners, the present master and voyage; and that it doth farther contain a true account of my lading, with the particular marks, numbers, quantity, quality, and consignment, of all the goods and merchandises in my said ship, to the best of my knowledge; and that I have not broke bulk, or delivered any goods out of my said ship, since her loading in. So help me God."

These words are so clear, express, and unambiguous, that they require no explanation. But who takes this plain oath without being knowingly and deliberately forsworn? Does one captain in fifty? Does one in five hundred? May we not go farther yet? Are there five captains of vessels now in London, who have not at one time or another, by this very oath, which they knew to be false when they took it, incurred the guilt of *wilful perjury?*

11. The oath which all officers of his Majesty's customs, take at their admission into their office, runs thus:

"I do swear to be true and faithful in the execution, to the best of my knowledge and power, of the trust committed to my charge and inspection, in the service of his Majesty's Customs: and that I will not take or receive, any reward or gratuity, directly or indirectly, other than my salary, or what is or shall be allowed me from the Crown, or the regular fees established by law, for any service done or to be done in the execution of my employment in the Customs, on any account whatsoever. So help me God."

On this it may be observed, 1. That there are regular fees, established by law, for some of these Officers; 2. That the rest do hereby engage, not to take or receive any reward or gratuity, directly or indirectly, other than their salary or allowance from the Crown, on any account whatsoever.

How do the former keep this solemn engagement? They whose fees are established by law? Do they take those established fees and no more? Do they not receive any farther gratuity? Not on any account whatsoever? If they do, they are undeniably guilty of *wilful perjury*.

And do the latter take no fees at all? Do they receive no reward or gratuity, for any service done, or to be done, in the execution of their employment? Do they not take any money, directly or indirectly, on any account whatsoever? Every time they do receive either more or less, they also are flatly forsworn.

Yet who scruples either the one or the other! Either taking a *larger fee* than the law appoints? Or the taking *any fee*, large or small, which is offered, even where the law appoints none at all?

What innumerable perjuries then are here committed, over and over, day by day! And without any remorse, without any shame! Without any fear either of God or Man!

12. I will produce but one instance more. The oath of one who votes for a Member of Parliament is this:

"I do swear, I have not received or had, by myself, or of any person whatsoever in trust for me, or for my use and benefit, directly or indirectly, any sum or sums of money, office, place or employment, gift or reward, or any promise or security for any money, office, employment or gift, in order to give my vote at this Election, and that I have not before been polled at this Election. So help me God."

We may observe here, 1. That this Oath is taken, once in seven years (if requested) by all the Freeholders, in every county throughout England and Wales, as well as all the Freemen in every City and Borough-Town; and 2. That hereby every Voter swears, in words liable to no evasion, that he has not received, directly or indirectly, any *gift* or *reward*, or promise of any.

But (to pass over those godless and shameless wretches, who frequently vote twice at one Election,) how few are there, who can take this oath with a conscience void of offence? Who have not received, directly or indirectly, any gift, or promise of any? No! have not you? If you have received nothing else, have not you received meat or drink? And did you pay for the meat or drink you received? If not, that was a gift; and, consequently, you are as really perjured, as the man that has received a hundred pounds!

What a melancholy prospect is then before us! Here are almost all the common people of any substance throughout the land, both in the city and country, calling God to record, to *known, wilful falsehoods!*

13. I shall conclude this head in the weighty words of the Author before cited.

"Most of these, I am afraid, look upon their Oaths as *things of course*, and little to be regarded. But can there be any thing in the world more sacred than an Oath? Is it not a solemn appeal to God for your sincerity? And is not that very appeal an acknowledgment, that he will surely

punish falsehood? Nay, farther, is it not a calling down the vengeance of God upon yourselves if you are false? Do you not, by laying your hand upon the Gospel, declare, That *you hope for no Salvation by Christ*, if you perform not what you then promise, or, if what you then affirm, is not true? And do not the words, *So help me God*, sufficiently prove, that the intention of your oath is so? And that if you swear false, you are to expect no mercy from God, either in this world or the next? And do you not personally and expressly give your consent to this heavy curse, by *kissing the Book?* How then dare any of you venture to play with so awful an engagement? Is it that you think the oath of a Grand Jury-man, or Parish-Officer, (of a Captain, an Officer of the Customs, or a Voter in Elections) is not as sacred and binding as that of an Evidence at the Bar? What is it can make the difference? Both of them are equally appeals to God, and imprecations of his vengeance upon *wilful perjury*."

14. If there be then a God that is not mocked, what a weight of sin lies on this nation? And sin of no common dye; for perjury has always been accounted one of the deepest stain. And how will any one attempt to excuse this? By adding blasphemy thereto? So indeed some have done; saying, like those of old, "Tush, thou God carest not for it. The Lord seeth (i. e. *regardeth*) us not. The Lord hath forsaken the earth." He hath left *second causes* to take their course, and man *in the hand of his own counsel.*

How many are they who now speak thus; according to whose minute Philosophy, the particular Providence of God is utterly exploded, *the hairs of our heads are* no longer numbered: and not only a sparrow, but a city, an empire may "fall to the ground, without the will" or care "of our heavenly Father." You allow then only a general Providence. I do not understand the term. Be so kind as to let me know, what you mean by a *General Providence*, contradistinguished from a *particular one?* I doubt you are at a loss for an answer; unless you use some huge, un-

wieldy thing, (I suppose resembling the *Primum Mobile* in the Ptolemaic System,) which continually whirls the whole Universe round, without affecting one thing more than another. I doubt this hypothesis will demand more proof, than you are at present able to produce; beside that it is attended with a thousand difficulties, such as you cannot readily solve. It may be therefore your wisest way for once to think with the vulgar, to acquiesce in the plain, scriptural account. This informs us, that although God dwelleth in heaven, yet he still ruleth over all: that his Providence extends to every individual in the whole system of Beings which he hath made: that all natural Causes of every kind, depend wholly upon his Will; and he increases, lessens, suspends, or destroys their efficacy, according to his own good pleasure: that he uses preternatural Causes at his Will, the ministry of good or of evil Angels: and that he hath never yet precluded himself from exerting his own immediate power, from speaking life or death into any of his creatures: from looking a world into being, or into nothing.

"Thinkest thou then, O man, that thou shalt escape the judgment of this great God?" O no longer "treasure up unto thyself wrath, against the day of wrath!" Thou canst not recall what is past; but now keep thyself pure, even were it at the price of all that thou hast: and acknowledge the goodness of God, in that he did not long since cut thee off, and send thee to thy own place.

15. The Jews of old were charged by God, with profaning his Sabbaths also. And do we Christians come behind them herein? (I speak of those who acknowledge the obligation.) Do we "call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable? Not doing our own ways, not finding our own pleasure, nor speaking our own words?" Do our "men-servants and maid-servants" rest thereon? And the "stranger that is within our gates?" Is no business, but what is really necessary, done within our house? You know in your own conscience, and God knoweth, that the very reverse of this is true.

But setting aside these things which are done as it were by stealth, whether by mean or honourable men; how many are they, in every city, as well as in this, who profane the Sabbath with a high hand! How many in this, that openly defy both God and the King, that break the laws both divine and human, by working at their trade, delivering their goods, receiving their pay, or following their ordinary business, in one branch or another, and "wiping their mouth and saying, *I do no evil!*" How many buy and sell on the Day of the Lord, even in the open streets of this city! How many open or (with some modesty) half open their shops! And when they have not the pretence of perishable goods; without any pretence at all, money is their god, and gain their godliness. But what are all these droves in the skirts of the town, that well nigh cover the face of the earth? Till they drop one after another into the numerous receptacles prepared for them in every corner. What are these to gain by profaning the Day of the Lord? Nothing at all. They "drink in iniquity like water." Nay, many of them pay for their sin; perhaps great part of what should sustain their family the ensuing week. I know not what is "finding our own pleasure, or doing our own ways," if this is not. What then shall we plead in your excuse? That "*Many others do it as well as you?*" Nay, number is so far from extenuating your fault, that it aggravates it above measure. For this is open war against God. A whole army of you join together, and with one consent, in the face of the sun, "run upon the thick bosses of his buckler."

16. It is once mentioned in the Prophets, "In thee (Jerusalem) they have set light by father and mother." But frequent mention is made of their setting light by their civil parents, of their murmurings and rebellings against their governors. Yet surely our boasting against them is excluded, even in this respect. For do not all our histories witness such a series of mutinies, seditions, factions, and rebellions, as are scarce to be paralleled in any other kingdom, since the world began? And has not the wild, tur-

bulent, ungovernable spirit of our countrymen, been continually acknowledged and lamented, (as abundance of their writings testify to this day,) by the cool, rational part of the nation? Terrible effects whereof have been seen and felt, more or less, in every generation.

But did this spirit exist only in times past? Blessed be God, it is now restrained, it does not break out;* but the traces thereof are still easy to be found. For whence springs this continual "speaking evil of dignities?" Of all who are at the helm of public affairs? Whence this "speaking evil of the ruler of our people," so common among all orders of men? I do not include those whose province it is to inspect all the public administrations. But is not almost every private gentleman in the land, every clergyman, every tradesman; yea every man or woman that has a tongue, a politician, a settler of the state? Is not every carman and porter abundantly more knowing than the king, lords, and commons together? Able to tell you all their foibles, to point out their faults and mistakes, and how they ought to proceed, if they will save the nation? Now all this has a natural, undeniable tendency to mutiny and rebellion. O what need have we above any nation on earth, of his continual care and protection, who alone is able to "rule the raging of the sea," and "still the madness of the people!"

17. But to proceed. Were there "drunkards in Ephraim, mighty to drink wine, men of strength to mingle strong drink?" And are there not in England? Are they not the growth of every county, city, and town therein? These do not indeed, or not often "rise up early, that they may follow strong drink;" and so "continue till night, till wine inflame them." They have found a readier way! namely, to begin at night, and continue following their wine and strong drink till the morning. And what numbers are there of these throughout the land? Lost to reason and

* N. B. This was written in the year 1744.

humanity, as well as to religion: so that no wonder "they regard not the work of the Lord, neither consider the operation of his hands."

Nor indeed have our drunkards need to continue from morning to night, until wine inflame them: seeing they have found a far more compendious method of casting aside all sense and reason, and disencumbering themselves from all remains, either of conscience or understanding. So that whatever work of darkness is speedily to be done, and that without any danger of being interrupted, either by fear, compassion, or remorse, they may be in a few moments, by one draught, as effectually qualified for it, as if they could swallow a legion of devils. Or, (if that be all their concern) they may, at a moderate expense, destroy their own body as well as soul, and plunge through this liquid fire, into that "prepared for the devil and his angels."

Friend, stop! you have the form of a man still. And perhaps some remains of understanding. O may the merciful God lay hold of that! Unto him all things are possible. Think a little for once. What is it you are doing? Why should you destroy yourself? I could not use the worst enemy I have in the world, as you use yourself. Why should you murder yourself inch by inch? Why should you burn yourself alive? O spare your own body at least, if you have no pity for your soul! But have you a soul then? Do you really believe it? What, a soul that must live for ever! O spare thy soul! Do not destroy thy own soul with an everlasting destruction! It was made for God. Do not give it into the hands of that old murderer of men! Thou canst not stupify it long. When it leaves the body, it will awake and sleep no more. Yet a little while, and it launches out into the great deep, to live, and think, and feel for ever. And what will cheer thy spirit there, if thou hast not "a drop of water to cool thy tongue?" But the die is not yet cast. Now cry to God, "and iniquity shall not be thy ruin."

18. Of old time there were also those that "were at ease in Zion, that lay upon beds of ivory, and stretched themselves upon their couches, that eat the lambs out of the

;, and calves out of the stall." But how inelegant
these ancient Epicures! ("Lambs out of the flock,
calves out of the stall!") Were these the best dainties
could procure? How have we improved, since Jero-
a's time? Who can number the varieties of our tables;
e arts we have *to enlarge the pleasure of tasting?* And
t are their couches, or beds of ivory, to the furniture of
apartments? Or their "chains and bracelets, and
tles, and changeable suits of apparel," to the ornaments
ur persons? What comparison is there between their
nions and ours? Look at Solomon in all his glory;
yet may we not question, whether he was not an utter
ger to the *pleasures of the Chase?* And notwith-
ding his forty thousand horses, did he ever see a race
s life? He made gardens, and orchards, and pools of
r; he planted vineyards and built houses. But had he
theatre among them all? No. This is the glory of
r times. Or had he any conception of a ball, an as-
bly, a masquerade, or a ridotto? And who imagines
all his instruments of music put together, were any
e to be compared to ours, than his or his father's
bling Hebrew verses,

"To the soft Sing Song of Italian lays?"

ll these points our pre-eminence over the Jews, is much
y way.

ea, and over our own ancestors as well as theirs.
is this our glory or our shame? Were Edward the
l, or Henry the Vth to come among us now, what would
r think of the change of their people? Would they
laud the elegant variety at the Old Baron's table? Or
costly delicacy of his furniture and apparel? Would
r listen to these instruments of music? Or find plea-
e in those diversions? Would they rejoice to see the
bles and Gentry of the land, lying at ease, stretching
mselves on beds of down? Too delicate to use their
1 limbs, even in the streets of the city: to bear the
ch of the people, the blowing of the wind, or the
ning of the sun! O how would their hearts burn within

them! What indignation, sorrow, shame must they feel, to see the ancient hardiness lost, the British temperance, patience, and scorn of superfluities, the rough, indefatigable industry, exchanged for softness, idleness, and fulness of bread! Well for them, that they were gathered unto their fathers, before this exchange was made!

19. To prove at large, That the luxury and sensuality, the sloth and indolence, the softness and idleness, the effeminacy and false delicacy of our nation are without a parallel, would but be lost labour. I fear, we may say, the *lewdness* too; for if the Jews, as the Prophet speaks, "assembled themselves by troops in the harlots' houses," so do the English, and much more abundantly. Indeed, where is male chastity to be found? Among the Nobility? Among the Gentry? Among the Tradesmen? Or among the common people of England? How few lay any claim to it at all! How few desire so much as the reputation of it! Would you yourself account it an honour or a reproach, to be ranked among those of whom it is said, "These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins?" And how numerous are they now, even among such as are accounted men of honour and probity, "who are as fed horses, every one neighing after his neighbour's wife?"

But as if this were not enough, is not the sin of Sodom too, more common among us than ever it was in Jerusalem? Are not our streets beset with those monsters of uncleanness, who "burn in their lust one toward another," whom God hath "given up to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient?" O Lord, thy compassions fail not: therefore we are not consumed.

20. Neither do we yield to them in *injustice* any more than *uncleanness*. How frequent are open robberies among us? Is not the act of violence even in our streets? And what laws are sufficient to prevent it? Does not *theft* of various kinds abound in all parts of the land, even though death be the punishment of it? And are there not among us, who "take usury and increase," who "greedily gain of their neighbour by extortion?" Yea, whole trades which subsist by

such extortion, as was not named either among the Jews or Heathens? "Is there not yet the scant measure, the wicked balances, and the bag of deceitful weights?" Beside the thousand nameless ways of over-reaching and defrauding, the craft and mystery of every trade and profession. It were an endless task to descend to particulars, to point out in every circumstance, how not only sharpers and gamesters, (those public nuisances, those scandals to the English nation) but high and low, rich and poor, men of character and men of note, in every station of public or private life, have corrupted themselves, and generally applaud themselves, and count it policy and wisdom so to do: so that if *gain* be at hand, they care not, though *justice stand afar off*: so that *he which departeth from evil*, which cometh not into their secret, still *maketh himself a prey*; and *the wicked still devoureth the man that is more righteous than he.*

And what redress? Suppose a great man to oppress the needy? Suppose the rich grinds the face of the poor: what remedy against such oppression can he find in this Christian country? If the one is rich and the other poor, doth not justice stand afar off? And is not the poor under the utmost improbability, (if not impossibility) of obtaining it? Perhaps the hazard is greater among us, than either among Jews, Turks, or Heathens.

For example. Suppose a great man, with or without form of law, does wrong to his poor neighbour. What will he do? Sue his Lordship at common law? Have the cause tried at the next sessions or assizes? Alas! Your own neighbours, those who know the whole case will tell you, "You are out of your senses." "But twelve good men and true will do me justice." Very well: but where will you find them: men unbiassed, incapable of corruption, superior both to fear and favour, to every view whether of gain or loss? But this is not all; they must not only be good and true, but wise and understanding men. Else how easy is it for a skilful pleader to throw a mist before their eyes? Even supposing too the Judge to be quite

impartial, and proof against all corruption. And should all these circumstances concur, (of which I fear there are not many precedents) supposing a verdict is given in your favour, still you have gained nothing. The suit is removed into a higher Court, and you have all your work to begin again. Here you have to struggle with all the same difficulties as before, and perhaps many new ones too. However, if you have money enough, you may succeed: but if that fails, your cause is gone. Without money, you can have no more law: poverty alone utterly shuts out justice.

But, "cannot an honest Attorney procure me justice?" An *honest* Attorney! Where will you find one? Of those who are called *exceeding honest* Attornies, who is there that makes any scruple,

1. To promote and encourage needless suits, if not unjust ones too?

2. To defend a bad Cause, knowing it so to be:

By making a Demur, and then withdrawing it:

By pleading some false plea, to the Plaintiff's Declaration:

By putting an evasive Answer to his Bill:

By protracting the Suit, if possible, till the Plaintiff is ruined:

3. To carry a Cause not amounting to ten shillings into Westminster-Hall, by laying it in his Declaration as above forty:

4. To delay his own Client's Suit knowingly and wilfully, in order to gain thereby:

5. To draw himself the Pleadings or Conveyances of his Client, instead of giving them to be drawn by able Counsel:

6. To charge his Client with the Fees which should have been given to such Counsel, although they were not given:

7. To charge for drawing fair copies, where none were drawn:

8. To charge Fees for expedition given to Clerks, when not one farthing has been given them:

9. To send his Clerk a journey (longer or shorter) to do business with or for different persons; and to charge the horse-hire and expense of that journey to every person severally:

10. To send his Clerk to Westminster, on the business of ten (it may be) or twenty persons, and to charge each of those twenty for his attendance, as if he had been sent on account of one only:

11. To charge his own attendance in like manner: And

12. To fill up his Bill with Attendances, Fees, and Term-fees, though his Client is no whit forwarder in his cause.

This is he that is called an *honest Attorney!* How much honester is a pickpocket!

But there is a Magistrate, whose peculiar office it is, to redress the injured and oppressed. Go then and make trial of this remedy; go, and tell your case to the Lord Chancellor. Hold; you must go on regularly: you must tell him your case, in form of law, or not at all. You must therefore file a Bill in Chancery, and retain a Lawyer belonging to that Court. "But you have already spent all you have: you have no money." Then I fear you will have no justice. You stumble at the threshold. If you have either lost or spent all, your Cause is naught: it will not even come to a hearing. So, if the oppressor has secured all that you had, he is as safe as if you were under the earth.

21. Now what an amazing thing is this! The very greatness of the villany makes it beyond redress!—But suppose he that is oppressed, has some substance left, and can go through all the Courts of Justice, what parallel can we find among Jews, Turks, or Heathens, for either the *delays* or the *expenses* attending it? With regard to the former, how monstrous is it, that in a suit relating to that inheritance, which is to furnish you and your family with food and raiment, you must wait month after month, perhaps year after year, before it is determined, whether it be yours or not? And what are you to eat or to wear in the

mean time? Of that the Court takes no cognizance! Is not this very *delay*, (suppose there were no other grievance attending the English course of law) wrong beyond all expression? Contrary to all sense, reason, justice, and equity? A capital Cause is tried in one day, and finally decided at once. And, is the life less than meat? Or the body of less concern than raiment? What a shameful mockery of justice then, is this putting off pecuniary causes from term to term, yea from year to year?

With regard to the latter. A man has wronged me of a hundred pounds. I appeal to a Judge for the recovery of it. How astonishing is it, that this Judge himself cannot give me what is my right, and what evidently appears so to be, unless I first give, perhaps one half of the sum, to men I never saw before in my life!

22. I have hitherto supposed, that all Causes when they are decided, are decided according to justice and equity. But is it so? Ye learned in the law, is no unjust sentence given in your Courts? Have not the same causes been decided quite opposite ways? One way, this Term, just the contrary, the next? Perhaps one way in the morning (this I remember an instance of) and another way in the afternoon: how is this? Is there no Justice left on earth? No regard for right or wrong? Or have causes been puzzled so long, that you know not now what is either wrong or right? What is agreeable to law or contrary to it? I have heard some of you frankly declare, that it is in many cases next to impossible to know, what is law, and what is not. So are your *folios* of Law multiplied upon you that no human brain is able to contain them: no; nor any consistent Scheme, or Abstract of them all.

But is it really owing to ignorance of the law, (this is the most favourable supposition) that so few of you scruple *taking Fees* on either side, of almost any cause that can be conceived? And that you generally plead in the manner you do on any side of any Cause? Rambling to and fro, in a way so abhorrent from common sense, and so utterly foreign to the question? I have been amazed at hearing the pleadings of some eminent Counsel: and when it has

fallen out that the Pleader on the other side understood only the common Rules of Logic, he has made those eminent men appear, either such egregious knaves, if they could help it, or such egregious blockheads, if they could not, that one would have believed, they would shew their faces there no more.—Mean time, if there be a God that judgeth righteously, what horrid insults upon him are these! "Shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord? Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"

23. There is one instance more of (I know not what to term it) injustice, oppression, sacrilege, which hath long cried aloud in the ears of God. For among men, who doth hear? I mean the management of many of those who are intrusted with our Public Charities. By the pious munificence of our forefathers, we have abundance of these, of various kinds. But is it not glaringly true, (to touch only on a few generals) that the managers of many of them, either, 1. Do not apply the benefaction to that use for which it was designed by the benefactor; or, 2. Do not apply it with such care and frugality, as in such a case are indispensably required; or, 3. Do not apply the whole of the benefaction to any charitable use at all; but secrete part thereof, from time to time, for the use of themselves and their families. Or, lastly, by plain, bare-faced oppression, exclude those from having any part in such benefaction, who dare (though with all possible tenderness and respect) set before them the things that they have done:

"Yet Brutus is an honourable man:
So are they all: all honourable men!"

And some of them, had in esteem for religion: accounted patterns both of honesty and piety! But God "seeth not as man seeth." He "shall repay them to their face." Perhaps, even in the present world. For that scripture is often still fulfilled, "This is the curse that goeth forth over the face of the whole earth. I will bring it forth, saith the Lord of Hosts, and it shall enter into the house of the thief," (such he is and no better, in the eyes of God, no whit honester than a highwayman) "and it shall remain in

the midst of the house, and shall consume it, with the timber thereof, and the stones thereof."

24. And is not *Truth*, as well as *Justice*, *fallen in our streets?* For who *speaketh the truth from his heart?* Who is there, that makes a conscience of speaking the thing as it is, whenever he speaks at all? Who scruples the telling of officious lies? The varying from Truth in order to do good? How strange does that saying of the ancient Father, sound in modern ears, "I would not tell a lie, no not to save the souls of the whole world." Yet is this strictly agreeable to the word of God: to that of St. Paul in particular, if any say, "Let us do evil that good may come, their damnation is just."

But how many of us do this evil, without ever considering, whether good will come or not? Speaking what we do not mean, merely out of custom, because it is fashionable so to do? What an immense quantity of falsehood does this ungodly fashion occasion day by day? For hath it not overrun every part of the nation? How is all our language swoln with compliment? So that a well-bred person is not expected to speak as he thinks: we do not look for it at his hands; nay, who would thank him for it? How few would suffer it? It was said of old, even by a Warrior and a King, "He that telleth lies shall not tarry in my sight:" but are we not of another mind? Do not we rather say, "He that telleth not lies shall not tarry in my sight?" Indeed the trial seldom comes; for both speakers and hearers are agread, that form and ceremony, flattery and compliment should take place, and truth be banished from all that know the world.

And if the rich and great have so small regard to truth, as to *lie* even for *lying sake*, what wonder can it be that men of lower rank will do the same thing *for gain?* What wonder that it should obtain, as by common consent in all kinds of *buying and selling?* Is it not an adjudged case, That it is no harm to tell lies in the way of trade? To say, that is the lowest price which is not the lowest; or that you will not take what you do take immediately? Insomuch

that it is a proverb even among the Turks, when asked to abate of their price, "What! do you take me to be a Christian!" So that never was that caution more seasonable than it is at this day, "Take ye heed every one of his neighbour, and trust ye not in any brother; for every brother will utterly supplant, and they will deceive every one his neighbour."

25. And as for those few who abstain from outward sins, is their heart right with God? May he not say of us also (as of the Jews) "This people is uncircumcised in heart?" Are not you? Do you then "love the Lord your God, with all your heart, and with all your strength?" Is he your God and your all? The desire of your eyes? The joy of your very heart? Rather, do you not set up your idols in your heart? Is not your belly your god? Or your diversion? Or your fair reputation? Or your friend? Or wife? Or child? That is plainly, do not you delight in some of these earthly goods, more than in the God of heaven? Nay, perhaps you are one of those grovelling souls that pant after the dust of the earth! Indeed, who does not? Who does not get as much as he can? Who of those that are not accounted covetous, yet does not gather all the money he can fairly, and perhaps much more? For are they those only whom the world rank among misers, that use every art to increase their fortune? Toiling early and late, spending all their strength in loading themselves with thick clay? How long? Until the very hour when God calleth them; when he saith unto each of them, "Thou fool! this night shall thy soul be required of thee! And whose shall those things be which thou hast prepared?"

26. And yet doth not our pride, even the pride of those whose soul cleaves to the dust, testify against us? Are they not wise in their own conceit? Have not writers of our own remarked, that there is not upon earth a more self-conceited nation than the English; more opinionated both of their own national and personal wisdom, and courage, and strength? And indeed, if we may judge by the inhabitants

of London, this is evident to a demonstration: for, are no the very meanest of them able to instruct both the King and all his Counsellors? What cobbler in London is not wiser than the Principal Secretary of State? What Coffee-house disputant is not an abler divine than his Grace of Canterbury? And how deep a contempt of others is joined with this high opinion of ourselves? I know not whether the people of other nations are greater masters of dissimulation; but there does not appear in any nation whatever, such a proneness to despise their neighbour; to despise not foreigners only (near two thousand years ago they remarked, *Britannos Hospitibus feros)* but their own countrymen; and that very often for such surprising reasons, as nothing but undeniable fact could make credible. How often does the gentleman in his coach despise those *dirty fellows that go on foot?* And these, on the other hand, despise full as much those *lazy fellows that loll in their coaches.* No wonder then that those who have the Form of Godliness should despise them that have not: that the saint of the world so frequently says to the gross sinner, in effect, if not in terms, "Stand by thyself; come not near unto me; for I am holier than thou!"

27. Yet what kind of holiness is this? May not God justly declare of us also, "This people draw near to me with their mouth, but they have removed their hearts far from me. They do but flatter me with their mouth, and dissemble with me in their tongue." Is it not so with you? When you speak to God, do your lips and your heart go together? Do you not often utter words by which you mean just nothing? Do not you say and unsay? Or, say one thing to God, and another to man? For instance, you say to God, "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep me this day without sin." But you say to man, This cannot be done; it is all folly and madness to expect it. You ask of God, That you "may perfectly love, and worthily magnify his holy Name:" but you tell man, There is no *perfect Love* upon earth: it is only a madman's dream. You pray God, to "cleanse the thoughts of your heart, by the inspiration

of his Holy Spirit." But you assure your neighbour, there is no such thing as inspiration now, and that none pretend to it but enthusiasts. What gross hypocrisy is this! Surely you think, there is no "knowledge in the Most High." "O be not deceived, God is not mocked. But whatsoever ye sow, that also shall ye reap!"

28. Such at present is the religion of this Christian nation! So do we honour him by whose Name we are called. And yet was there ever a nation more careless and secure? More unapprehensive of the wrath of God? How can a man more effectually expose himself to the ridicule of those who are esteemed men of understanding, than by shewing any concern, as if the judgments of God were hanging over our heads? * Surely then "a deceived heart hath turned us aside, that we cannot say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?" Surely this our confidence is not of God: it is rather a judicial infatuation; a stupid insensibility; a deep sleep, the forerunner of heavy vengeance.

"Ruin behind it stalks, and empty desolation."

Surely never was any people more fitted for destruction! "Impudent children are they, and stiff-hearted. Are they ashamed when they have committed abomination?" When they have openly profaned the day of the Lord? When they have committed lewdness? Or when they have uttered such curses and blasphemies, as are not heard of among the heathens? Nay, "they are not at all ashamed, neither can they blush." And though God send unto them all his servants, rising up early and sending them, yet "will they not hear; they harden their neck! They do worse than their fathers."

What then can God "do more for his vineyard which he hath not done?" He hath long tried us with mercies, "giving rain and fruitful seasons, filling us with the flour of wheat." We have had plenty of all things; and while war roared around, "peace has been in all our borders." But

* N. B. This was written in the year 1744, but I am afraid it is too true, even at this day.

still "this revolting and rebellious people say not, Let us now fear the Lord our God." Nay, they gave him no thanks for all his mercies; they did not even acknowledge them to be his gift. They did not see the hand of God in any of these things; they could account for them another way. O ye unwise, when will ye understand? Know ye not yet, there is a God that ruleth the world? What did ye see with your eyes? Was the race to the swift, or the battle to the strong? Have ye forgotten Dettingen already? Does not England know that God was there?—Or suppose your continuance in peace, or success in war, be the mere result of your own wisdom and strength; do ye command the sun and the clouds also? Can ye pour out or stay the bottles of heaven? But let it all be nature, chance, any thing—so God may have no hand in governing the earth!

29. Will his judgments bring us to a better mind? Do we "hear the rod and him that has appointed it?" Let us observe: what fruit do we find in those who are "even consumed by means of his heavy hand?" Let any that desires to be clearly satisfied herein visit the hospitals of this city. Let him judge for himself, how the patients there receive God's fatherly visitation; especially there, because mercy also is mixed with judgment; so that it is evident "that the Lord loveth whom he chasteneth." Go into any ward, either of men or women, look narrowly from one end to the other: are they humbling themselves under the hand of God? Are they trembling under a sense of his anger? Are they praising him for his love? Are they exhorting one another, not to faint when they are rebuked of him? How do nine in ten of them spend their time, that important time from morning to evening? Why in such a manner, that you would not easily learn, from thence, whether they were Christians, Pagans, or Mahometans.

Is there any deeper distress than this to be found? Is there a greater affliction than the loss of health? Perhaps there is, the loss of liberty, especially as it is sometimes circumstanced. You may easily be convinced of this, by

going into either Ludgate or Newgate. What a scene appears, as soon as you enter! The very place strikes horror into your soul. How dark and dreary! How unhealthy and unclean! How void of all that might minister comfort! But this is little, compared to the circumstances that attend the being confined in this shadow of death. See that poor wretch, who was formerly in want of nothing, and encompassed with friends and acquaintance, now cut off by an unexpected stroke, from all the cheerful ways of men; ruined, forsaken of all, and delivered into the hands of such masters and such companions! I know not, if to one of a thinking, sensible turn of mind, there could be any thing like it on this side hell.

What effect then has this heavy visitation of God, on those who lie under it for any time? There is, perhaps, an exception here and there; but in general they are abandoned to all wickedness, utterly divested of all fear of God, and all reverence to man; insomuch that they commonly go out of that school completely fitted for any kind or degree of villany, perfectly brutal and devilish, thoroughly furnished for every evil word and work.

30. Are your countrymen more effectually reclaimed, when danger and distress are joined? If so, the Army, especially in time of war, must be the most religious part of the nation. But is it so indeed? Do the soldiery walk as those who see themselves on the brink of eternity? Redeeming every opportunity of glorifying God, and doing good to men, because they know not the hour in which their Lord will require their souls of them? So far from it, that a soldier's religion is a by-word, even with those who have no religion at all; that vice and profaneness in every shape reign among them without control; and that the whole tenor of their behaviour speaks, *Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.*

Have those who are exposed to still more danger, the English sea-forces, more religion than those at land? It is said they were once remarkable for this: and it is certain Sir Francis Drake feared God, as did most of his commanders; and we have reason to believe, his mariners and

sailors too. But what shall we say of the Navy that now is, more particularly of the ships of war? Is religion there? Either the power or the form? Is not almost every single man of war a mere floating hell? Where is there to be found more consummate wickedness, a more full daring contempt of God, and all his laws, except in the bottomless pit? But here description fails: and the goodness of God endureth yet daily! But *shall I not visit for these things, saith the Lord? Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?* O that the prospect of national judgments may suffice! That we may remember ourselves, and turn unto the Lord our God, before his long-suffering mercy is at an end, and he pours out the vials of his wrath upon us!

But how small ground have we as yet to hope for this! For who will now "suffer the word of exhortation?" How few will "endure sound doctrine," and the honest, close application of it! Do they not "say unto the seers, See not; and unto the prophets, Prophesy smooth things?" And if a man will do thus, if he will "sew pillows to all arm-holes," and "cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before them; if he will prophesy of wine and strong drink, he shall even be the prophet of this people."

31. I am sensible how nice a subject this is, and how extremely difficult it is so to speak, as neither to say too little nor too much, neither more nor less than the cause of God requires. I know also that it is absolutely impossible, so to speak as not to give offence. But whosoever is offended I dare not be silent; neither may I refrain from plainness of speech: only I will endeavour to use all the tenderness I can consistently with that plainness.

In tender love then, I ask, Are there none among us, (I speak to you, my brethren, who are priests and prophets of the Lord, set apart to "minister in holy things," and to "declare the word of the Lord,") are there none among us who commit lewdness, as did those by whom "Israel was defiled?" Hath not the Lord seen a horrible thing, in some of the prophets of this land also, even, that "they commit adultery, and (to conceal it) walk in lies?" God

Forbid that I should affirm this. I only propose (not maintain) the question. If there be such a wretch, I pray God to strike him to the heart, and to say, *Thou art the man!*

Are there none of you, like them, "mighty to drink wine, men of strength to mingle strong drink?" Yea, are there none that "err through strong drink, that are swallowed up of wine?" Are there not found those who say, "I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink: and to-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant?"

Alas, my brother! Is this the voice of a minister of Christ? "A steward of the mysteries of God?" Suppose you find at any time trouble and heaviness, "is there no help for you in your God?" Is not the God whom you serve able to deliver you from any plague or trouble? Is the being drunk with wine a better relief, than being filled with his Spirit? Do you not understand this? Do you not know the Lord? Take heed you do not destroy both your own soul and them that hear you! O beware! If you know not his love, fear his power! Make haste to flee from the wrath to come, lest he smite you with a curse great as your sin, and sweep you away from the face of the earth.

32. Can such as you be said, to honour or fear God, any more than those spoken of by Malachi? May not God complain, "These priests have violated my law and profaned my holy things?" Yea, whensoever you presume with those unhallowed hands, to touch the mysteries of God: whensoever you utter his name or his word with those unhallowed lips! But is it on this account only that God may say, "Both prophet and priest are profane?" May he not add, "They have put no difference between the holy and the profane; therefore I am profaned among them?" For is it not so? Do you put a difference between the holy and the profane, him that feareth God, and him that feareth him not? Do you put an effectual difference between them, even in the most solemn office of our religion? At the table of the Lord, do you take care to "separate the pre-

cious from the vile?" To receive all those who (as you may reasonably believe) "draw near with penitent hearts, and lively faith," and utterly to reject those who testify against themselves, that they are without hope and without God in the world?

Nay, who dares repel any one of the great men in his parish from the Lord's table? Even though he be a drunkard or a common swearer? Yea, though he openly deny the Lord that bought him? Mr. Stonehouse did this once. But what was the event? The gentleman brought an action against him, for the terror of all such insolent fellows, in succeeding times. And who was able and willing to espouse the cause? He alone who took it into his own hand; and before the day when it should have been tried here, called the plaintiff to answer at a higher bar.

33. O my brethren, is it not for want of your making this difference, as well as for many other abominations, that, with regard to some among us, (how many God knoweth,) that scripture is now also fulfilled, "His watchmen are blind, they are ignorant, they are shepherds that cannot understand."—"The Lord hath poured out upon them the spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed their eyes: the prophets and the seers hath he covered. And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee; and he saith, I cannot; for it is sealed?"

If you ask what those other abominations are? I will speak in love and in the spirit of meekness. There are found among us covetous men, men "who mind earthly things," who seek themselves and not Christ crucified, who "love the world, and the things of the world:" men in whom these words are still fulfilled, "Who is there among you that would shut the doors for nought? Neither do ye kindle fire on my altar for nought. I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts." Yea, are there not those at this day, (O that I might be found to fear where no fear is!) who "make themselves fat with the chiefest of all the offerings of Israel?" Are there not those, who now "enlarge

their desires as hell, who are as death, and cannot be satisfied?" Who, though they want neither food to eat nor raiment to put on, yet seek more and more preferment? Who are continually studying to "join house to house, and to lay field to field?" To grow rich in the service of that Master, who himself "had not where to lay his head?" Is it not to these that those dreadful words belong, enough to cause the ears of him that heareth to tingle, "They are greedy dogs which can never have enough; they all look to their own way, (not the way of their Lord,) every one for his gain from his quarter?"

Is it strange if, among these, there should be some who are cruel, oppressive men? Inasmuch as covetousness knows no mercy, nor can a lover of money be a lover of his neighbour. Have not some been known even to "grind the face of the poor?" To strip, rather than clothe the naked? Some, who while they cried out, "as the horse-leach, Give, give," would take if it were not given; like those of old who said, "Thou shalt give it me now, and if not, I will take it by force:" or those spoken of by Micah, "The prophets bite with their teeth, and cry peace: and he that putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare war against him." Very great is the sin of these men before the Lord. If there be ten such now in the land, may God smite them this day with terror and astonishment, that they may have no rest in their bones till their sin is done away!

34. Are you as watchful and zealous to gain souls, as those are to gain the gold that perisheth? Do you know by experience what that meaneth, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up?" Or are you one of those watchmen who do not watch at all? Who neither know nor care when the sword cometh? Of whom the prophet saith, "They are dumb dogs that cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber?"

Can it be supposed, that such shepherds will feed the flock? Will "give to every one his portion of meat in due season?" Will these "warn every man, and exhort every

man, that they may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus?" Will they take care to "know all their flock by name, not forgetting the men-servants and women-servants?" Will they inquire into the state of every soul committed to their charge? And watch over each with all tenderness and long-suffering, "as they that must give account?" Marking how they either fall or rise? How these wax "weary and faint in their mind;" and those "grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ?" Who can do this, unless his whole heart be in the work? Unless he desire nothing but to "spend and be spent for them;" and "count not his life dear unto himself," so he may "present them blameless" in the day of the Lord Jesus?

Can any Shepherd do this (and if he do it not, he will never "give any account with joy") who imagines, he has little more to do, than to preach once or twice a week? That this is the main point, the chief part of that office, which he hath taken upon himself before God? What gross ignorance is this! What a total mistake of the truth! What a miserable blunder touching the whole nature of his office! It is indeed a very great thing, To speak in the name of God; it might make him that is of the stoutest heart tremble, if he considered, That every time he speaks to others, his own soul is at stake. But great, inexpressibly great as this is, it is perhaps the least part of our work. To "seek and to save that which is lost," to bring souls from Satan to God, to instruct the ignorant, to reclaim the wicked, to convince the gainsayer: to direct their feet into the way of peace, and then keep them therein; to follow them step by step, lest they turn out of the way, and advise them in their doubts and temptations; to lift up them that fall, to refresh them that are faint, and to comfort the weak-hearted; to administer various helps, as the variety of occasions require, according to their several necessities. These are parts of our office; all this we have undertaken at the peril of our own soul. A sense of this made that holy man

of old cry out, "I marvel if any ruler in the Church shall be saved:" and a greater than he says, in the fulness of his heart, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

35. But who is not sufficient for these things, for the taking care of a parish, though it contain twenty thousand souls, if this implies no more than the taking care to preach there, once or twice a-week; and to procure one to read prayers on the other days, and do what is called the parish duty? Is any trade in the nation so easy as this? Is not any man sufficient for it, without any more talents, either of nature or grace, than a small degree of common understanding? But, O! what manner of shepherds are those, who look no farther into the nature of their office, who sink no deeper into the importance of it than this! Were they not such as these concerning whom the "word of the Lord came unto Ezekiel, saying, Woe be to the shepherds that do feed themselves: should not the shepherds feed the flock? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool; but ye feed not the flock. The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost. And they were scattered, because there was no shepherd, and they became meat to all the beasts of the field. Yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them."

I conjure you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus, the great Shepherd of the sheep, who hath bought them and us with his own blood, apply this each to his own soul. Let every man look unto God and say, Lord, *Is it I?* Am I one of these idle, careless, indolent shepherds, that feed myself, not the flock? Am I one that cannot bark, slothful, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber? One of those who have not strengthened that which was diseased, neither healed that which was sick? "Search me, O Lord, and prove me; try out my reins and my heart. Look well if

there be any way of wickedness in me, and lead me in the way everlasting."

36. Have I not at least, "healed the hurt of thy people slightly?" Have I not said, "Peace, peace, when there was no peace?"—How many are they also that do this? Who do not study to speak what is true, especially to the rich and great, so much as what is pleasing? Who flatter honourable sinners instead of telling them plainly, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" O what an account have you to make, if there be a God that judgeth the earth! Will he not require at your hands the blood of all these souls, of whom ye are the betrayers and murderers? Well spake the prophets of your fathers, in whose steps you now tread, "They have seduced my people, and one built upon a wall, and another daubed it with untempered mortar. They strengthen the hands of the evil-doers, that none doth return from his wickedness. They prophesy lies in my name, saith the Lord. They say unto them that despise me, Ye shall have peace, and unto them that walk after the imagination of their own heart, No evil shall come upon you."

How great will your damnation be, who destroy souls, instead of saving them! Where will you appear, or how will you stand, "in that great and terrible day of the Lord!" How will you lift up your heads, when "the Lord descends from heaven in flaming fire, to take vengeance on his adversaries!" More especially on those who have so betrayed his cause, and done Satan's work under the banner of Christ! With what voice wilt thou say, "Behold me, Lord, and the sheep whom thou hadst given me, whom I gave to the devil, and told them they were in the way to heaven, till they dropped into hell?"

Were they not just such shepherds of souls as you are, concerning whom God spake by Jeremiah? "Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard, they have trodden my portion under foot; they have made my portion a desolate wilderness:" by Ezekiel, "There is a conspiracy of her

prophets, like a roaring lion, ravening the prey, they have devoured souls:" and by Zechariah, "Thus saith the Lord, Feed the flock of the slaughter, whose possessors slay them, and hold themselves not guilty! and they that sell them say, Blessed be the Lord, for I am rich; and their own shepherds pity them not."

37. Is not this the real ground, the principal reason of the present contempt of the Clergy? And long since was it assigned as such, by him who cannot lie. The same men of old, who made the Lord's people to transgress, thereby made themselves vile. They were despised both as the natural effect, and the judicial punishment of their wickedness. And the same cause the prophet observes to have produced the same effect, many hundreds of years after this, "Ye are departed out of the way, saith the Lord; ye have caused many to stumble—Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people."

I have now, brethren, "delivered my own soul," and in so doing, I have (as I proposed at first) "used great plainness of speech," as not studying "to please men, but the Lord." The event I leave to him in whose name I have spoken, and who hath the hearts of all men in his hand.

I have brought you heavy tidings this day, and yet I cannot but be persuaded, that some of you will not count me your enemy, because I tell you the truth. O that all of us may taste the good word which we declare! May receive that knowledge of salvation, which we are commanded to preach unto every creature, through the remission of sins! My heart's desire is, That all of us, to whom is committed the ministry of Reconciliation, may ourselves be reconciled to God, through the blood of the everlasting covenant: That he may be henceforth unto us a God, and we may be unto him a people; that we may all know as well as preach the Lord from the least unto the greatest: even by that token, "I am merciful to thy unrighteousness: thy sins I remember no more!"

III. 1. I have hitherto spoken more immediately to those, who profess themselves members of the Church of England.

But inasmuch as I am a debtor also to those who do not, my design is now to apply to them also; and briefly to shew, wherein (I fear) they are severally inconsistent with their own principles.

I begin with those who are at the smallest distance from us, whether they are termed Presbyterians or Independents. Of whom in general I cannot but have a widely different opinion, from that I entertained some years ago: as having since that conversed with many among them, "in whom the root of the matter is" undeniably "found:" and who labour "to keep a conscience void of offence both towards God and towards man." I cannot therefore doubt, but every serious man, of either one or the other denomination, does utterly condemn all that inward as well as outward unholiness, which has been above described.

But do you, as a people, avoid what you condemn? Are no whoremongers or adulterers found among you? No children disobedient to their parents? No servants that are slothful or careless? That "answer again?" That do not "honour their masters as is meet in the Lord?" Are there none among you that censure or "speak evil of the ruler of their people?" Are there no drunkards, no gluttons, no luxurious men, no regular epicures, none whose belly is their god, who, as their fortune permits, "fare sumptuously every day?" Have you no dishonest dealers, no unfair traders, no usurers, or extortioners? Have you no liars, either for gain, or for good manners, so called? Are you clear of ceremony or compliment? Alas, you are sensible, in most, if not in all these respects, you have now small pre-eminence over us. How much more sensible must you be of this, if you do not rest on the surface, but inquire into the bottom of religion, the religion of the heart? For, what inward unholiness, what evil tempers are among us, which have not a place among you also? You likewise bewail that ignorance of God, that want of faith and of the love of God and man, that inward idolatry of various kinds, that pride, ambition, and vanity, which rule in the hearts even of those who still have "the form of godliness."

You lament before God, the deep covetousness that *eats so many souls as doth a Gangrene;* and perhaps are sometimes ready to cry out, "Help, Lord, for there is scarce one godly man left." Lay to thine hand: "for the faithful are minished from the children of men!"

2. And yet you retain "the truth that is after godliness," at least, as to the substance of it. You own what is laid down in Scripture, both touching the *nature and condition of Justification and Salvation.* And with regard to the *Author of Faith and Salvation,* you have always avowed, even in the face of your enemies, That "it is God which worketh in us, both to will and to do, of his good pleasure:" that it is his Spirit alone which "teacheth us all things," all we know of "the deep things of God:" that every true believer has an "Unction from the Holy One" to lead him into all *necessary* Truth: that "because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father;" and this Spirit "beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

How is it then, my brethren (so I can call you now, although I could not have done it heretofore:) how is it, that the generality of you also are fallen from your steadfastness? In the times of persecution ye stood as a rock, though all the waves and storms went over you. But who can bear ease and fulness of bread? How are you changed, since these came upon you! Do not many of you now (practically I mean) put something else, in the room of Faith that worketh by love? Do not some of you suppose that gravity and composedness of behaviour, are the main parts of Christianity? Especially, provided the persons who possess them neither swear, nor take the name of God in vain. Do not others imagine, that to abstain from idle songs, and those fashionable diversions, commonly used by persons of their fortune, is almost the whole of Religion? To which, if they add family prayer, and a strict observation of the sabbath, then doubtless all is well! Nay, my brethren, this is well, so so far as it goes: but how little a way does it go towards Christianity! All these things, you cannot but see, are

merely external; whereas Christianity is an inward thing; without which the most beautiful outward form is lighter than vanity.

Do not others of you rest in conviction? Or good desires? Alas, what do these avail? A man may be convinced he is sick, yea deeply convinced, and yet never recover. He may desire food, yea with earnest desire, and nevertheless perish with hunger. And thus I may be convinced I am a sinner: but this will not justify me before God. And I may desire salvation, (perhaps by fits and starts for many years) and yet be lost for ever. Come close then to the point, and keep to your principles. Have you received the Holy Ghost; the Spirit which is of God, and is bestowed by him on all believers, "that we may know the things which are freely given to us of God?" The time is short. Do you experience now that Unction from the Holy One? Without which you confess outward Religion, whether negative or positive, is nothing. Nay, and inward Conviction of our wants is nothing, unless those wants are in fact supplied. Good Desires also are nothing, unless we actually attain what we are stirred up to desire. For still, "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, whatever he desires, he is none of his." O my brother, beware you stop not short! Beware you never account yourself a Christian, no not in the lowest degree, till God "hath sent forth the Spirit of Christ into your heart," and that Spirit "bear witness with your spirit, that you are a child of God."

3. One step farther from us, are you who are called, (though not by your own choice,) Anabaptists. The smallness of your number, compared to that either of the Presbyterians, or those of the Church, makes it easier for you to have an exact knowledge of the behaviour of all your members, and to put away from among you every one that "walketh not according to the doctrine you have received." But is this done? Do all your members adorn the Gospel? Are they all "holy as he who hath called us is holy?" I fear not. I have known some instances to the contrary: and doubtless you know many more. There are unholy,

outwardly unholy men, in your congregations also: men that profane either the Name or the Day of the Lord; that do not honour their natural or civil Parents; that know not how to possess their bodies in sanctification and honour; that are intemperate, either in meat or drink, gluttonous, sensual, luxurious; that variously offend against Justice, Mercy, or Truth, in their intercourse with their neighbour, and do not walk by that Royal Law, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." But how is this consistent with your leading principles, "that no man ought to be admitted to baptism, till he has that Repentance whereby we forsake sin, and living faith in God, through Christ?" For if no man ought to be admitted into a Church or Congregation, who has not actual Faith and Repentance, then neither ought any one who has them not, to continue in any Congregation. And consequently an open sinner cannot remain among you, unless you practically renounce your main principle.

4. I refer it to your own serious consideration, whether one reason, why unholy men are still suffered to remain among you, may not be this: That many of you have unawares put Opinion in the room of Faith and Repentance? But how fatal a mistake is this? Supposing your opinion to be true, yet a true opinion concerning Repentance is wholly different from the thing itself. And you may all your life have a true opinion concerning faith, and yet die an unbeliever. Supposing, therefore, the opinion of Particular Redemption true, yet how little does it avail towards salvation? Nay, were we to suppose, That none can be saved who do not hold it, it does not follow, that all will be saved who do. So that if the one proved a man to be in ever so bad a state, the other would not prove him to be in a good one. And, consequently, whosoever leans on this opinion, "leans on the staff of a broken reed."

Would to God that ye would mind this one thing, to make your calling and election sure! That every one of you, (leaving the rest of the world to him that made it,) would himself repent and believe the gospel! Not repent

alone, (for then you know only the baptism of John,) but believe, and be "baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Are you still a stranger to that inward Baptism, wherewith all true believers are baptized? May the Lord constrain you to cry out, "How am I straitened till it be accomplished?" Even till the love of God inflame your heart, and consume all your vile affections. Be not content with any thing less than this! It is this loving faith alone which opens our way into "the general church of the first-born whose names are written in heaven!" Which giveth us to "enter within the veil, where Jesus our Forerunner is gone before us!"

5. There is still a wider difference in some points, between us and the people usually termed Quakers. But not in these points. You, as well as we, condemn "all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men;" all those works of the devil which were recited above, and all those tempers from which they spring. You agree, that we are all to be taught of God; and to be led by his Spirit; that the Spirit alone reveals all Truth, and inspires all Holiness: that by his inspiration men attain perfect love, the love which purifies them as he is pure; and that through this knowledge and love of God, they have power to do always such things as please him; to worship God, a Spirit, according to his own will, that is, in spirit and in truth. Hence you infer, that formal Worship is not acceptable to God, but that alone that springs from God in the heart: you infer also, that they who are led by him, will use great plainness of speech, and great plainness of dress, seeking no "outward adorning, but only the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit." I will look no farther now, than simply to inquire, whether you are consistent with these principles?

To begin with the latter: "He that is led by the Spirit will use great plainness of speech." You would have said, *Will use the plain language.* But that term leads you into a grand mistake. That term, *the plain language,* naturally leads you to think of one particular way of speaking; as if

plainness of speech implied no more, than the use of that *particular form*. Alas! my brethren! Know ye not, that your ancestors designed this, only as a specimen of plain language? And is it possible that you should mistake the sample for the whole bale of cloth? Consult the light God has given you, and you must see that plainness of speech does not lie in a single point, but implies an open, undisguised sincerity, a child-like simplicity in all we speak. I do not desire you to refrain from saying *thou* or *thee*. I would not spend ten words about it. But I desire you whenever you speak at all, to speak the truth, and nothing but the truth. I desire your words may be always the picture of your heart. This is truly plain language. Either do not pretend to plain speech at all, or be uniformly plain. Are you so? I pray consider. Do you never compliment? I do not suppose you say, *Sir, your very humble servant.* But do you say no civil things? Do you never flatter? Do you not commend any man or woman to their face? Perhaps farther than you do behind their back. Is this plainness of speech? Do you never dissemble? Do you speak to all persons, high or low, rich or poor, just what you think, neither more nor less, and in the shortest and clearest manner you can? If not, what a mere jest is your plain language? You carry your condemnation in your own breast.

6. You hold also, That "he which is led by the Spirit, will use great plainness of dress, seeking no outward adorning, but only the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit." And that, in particular, "he will leave gold and costly apparel, to those who know not God." Now I appeal to every serious, reasonable man among you, Do your people act consistently with this principle? Do not many of your women wear gold upon their very feet? And many of your men use ornaments of gold? Are you a stranger to these things? Have you not seen with your eyes, (such trifles as will scarce bear the naming,) their canes and snuff-boxes glitter, even in your solemn assembly, while ye were waiting together upon God? Surely,

they are not yet so lost to modesty, as to pretend, That they do not use them by way of ornament. If they do not, if it be only out of necessity, a plain oaken-stick will supply the place of the one, and a piece of horn or tin will unexceptionably answer all the reasonable ends of the other.

To speak freely, (and do not count me your enemy for this,) you cannot but observe upon cool reflection, That you retain just so much of your ancient practice, as leaves your present without excuse; as makes the inconsistency between the one and the other, glaring and undeniable. For instance: this woman is too strict a Quaker, to lay out a shilling in a Necklace. Very well: but she is not too strict to lay out fourscore guineas in a repeating Watch. Another would not for the world wear any Lace, no, not an Edging round her cap. But she will wear Point; and sees no harm in it at all, though it should be of twelve times the price. In one kind of Apron or Handkerchief she dares not lay out twenty shillings; but in another sort, lays out twenty pounds. And what multitudes of you are very jealous, as to the colour and form of your apparel, (the least important of all the circumstances that relate to it) while in the most important, the expense, they are without any concern at all? They will not put on a Scarlet or Crimson Stuff, but the richest Velvet, so it be black or grave. They will not touch a coloured Ribband; but will cover themselves with a stiff Silk from head to foot. They cannot bear Purple: but make no scruple at all of being clothed in fine Linen: yea, to such a degree, that the linen of the Quakers is grown almost into a proverb. Surely you cannot be ignorant, that the sinfulness of fine apparel, lies chiefly in the expensiveness. In that it is robbing God and the Poor; it is defrauding the fatherless and widow; it is wasting the food of the hungry, and with-holding his raiment from the naked, to consume it on our own lusts.

7. Let it not be said, That this affects only a few among you, and those of the younger and lighter sort. Yes it

does; your whole body: for why do you, who are elder and graver, suffer such things? Why do ye not vehemently reprove them? And if they repent not, in spite of all worldly considerations, expel them out of your Society? In conniving at their sin, you make it your own; you especially who are Preachers. Do you say, "They cannot bear it; they will not hear:" alas, into what state then are ye fallen! But whether they will bear it or not, what is that to thee? Thou art to speak, "whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." To say the very truth, I I am afraid you rather strengthen their hands in their wickedness. For you not only * do not testify against it in the congregation, but even sit at their table and reprove them not. Why then, Thou also art one of the "Dumb Dogs that cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber." I fix this charge upon every Preacher, in particular upon those who saw a young woman, daughter to one of the Quakers in London, going to be married in apparel suitable to her diamond buckle, which cost a

* You say, "We do testify against it in the congregation;" Against what? "Against gay and gaudy apparel." I grant it. But this is not the thing I speak of. You quite mistake my mark. Do you testify against the Costliness of their Apparel, however plain and grave it may be? Against the price of the Velvet, the Linen, the Silk, or Raiment of whatever kind? If you do this frequently and explicitly, you are clear. If not, own and amend the fault.

It is easy to discern how your people fell into this snare of the devil. You were at first a poor, despised, afflicted people. Then, what some of you had to spare, was little enough to relieve the needy members of your own Society. In a few years you increased in goods, and were able to relieve more than your own Poor. But you did not bestow all that you had to spare from them, on the Poor belonging to other Societies. It remained either to lay it up, or to expend it in superfluities. Some chose one way, and some the other.

Lay this deeply to heart, ye who are now a poor, despised, afflicted people. Hitherto ye are not able to relieve your own Poor. But if ever your substance increase, see that ye be not straitened in your own bowels, that ye fall not into the same snare of the devil. Before any of you either lay up treasures on earth or indulge needless expense of any kind, I pray the Lord God to scatter you to the corners of the earth, and blot out your name from under heaven!

hundred guineas. Could you see this, and not call heaven and earth to witness against it? Then I witness against thee, in the Name of the Lord, Thou art a "blind Leader of the Blind:" thou "strainest at a gnat and swallowest a camel." Verily the sin both of teachers and hearers, is herein exceeding great. And the little attempts towards plainness of apparel, which are still observable among you, (I mean, in the colour and form of your clothes, and the manner of putting them on,) only testify against you, That you were once what you know in your hearts you are not now.

8. I come now to your main Principle, "We are all to be taught of God, to be inspired and led by his Spirit. And then we shall worship him, not with a dead form, but in spirit and in truth." These are deep and weighty words. But many hold fast the words, and are utterly ignorant of their meaning. Is not this an exceeding common case? Are not you conscious, abundance of your friends have done so? With whom the being taught of God, and led by his Spirit, are mere words of course, that mean just nothing. And their crude and indigested accounts, of the things they did not understand, have raised that deep prejudice against these great Truths, which we find in the generality of men.

Do some of you ask, "But dost thou acknowledge the Inward Principle?" I do, my friends: and I would to God every one of you acknowledged it as much. I say, all Religion is either empty Shew, or Perfection by Inspiration; in other words, the obedient Love of God, by the supernatural knowledge of God; yea, all that which is not of faith, is sin: all which does not spring from this loving knowledge of God; which knowledge cannot begin, or subsist one moment, without immediate inspiration: not only all public worship, and all private prayer, but every thought in common life, and word, and work. What think you of this? Do you not stagger? Dare you carry the inward Principle so far? Do you acknowledge it to be the very truth? But, alas! what is the acknowledging it; dost thou experience this principle in thyself: what saith

†

thy heart? Does God dwell therein? And doth it now echo to the voice of God? Hast thou the continual inspiration of his Spirit, filling thy heart with his love, as with a well of water, springing up into everlasting life?

9. Art thou acquainted with the Leading of his Spirit, not by notion only, but by living experience? I fear very many of you talk of this, who do not so much as know what it means. How does the Spirit of God lead his children, to this or that particular action? Do you imagine, it is by blind Impulse only? By moving you to do it, you know not why? Not so. He leads us by our Eye, at least as much as by the Hand; and by Light as well as by Heat. He shews us the way wherein we should go, as well as incites us to walk therein. For example. Here is a man ready to perish with hunger. How am I led by the Spirit to relieve him? First, by his convincing me, it is the Will of God I should; and, secondly, by his filling my heart with love towards him. Both this light and this heat are the gift of God; are wrought in me by the same Spirit; who leads me, by this Conviction as well as Love, to go and feed that man. This is the plain, rational account of the ordinary leading of the Spirit. But how far from that which some have given! Art thou thus led by the Spirit to every good word and work? Till God hath thereby made thy faith perfect? Dost thou know what Faith is? It is a loving, obedient sight of a present and reconciled God. Now where this is, there is no dead form; neither can be, so long as it continues. But all that is said or done is full of God, full of spirit, and life, and power.

10. But perhaps, as much as you talk of them, you do not know the difference between Form and Spirit; or between worshipping God in a formal way, and worshipping him in spirit and in truth. The Lord is that Spirit. The seeing, and feeling, and loving him, is spiritual Life. And whatever is said or done in the sight and love of God, that is full of spirit and life. All beside this is form, mere dead form; whether it be in our public addresses to God, or in our private; or in our worldly business, or in our daily

conversation. But if so, how poor, and mean, and narrow have your views and conceptions been! You were afraid of formality in public worship. And reason good. But were you afraid of it no where else? Did not you consider, That formality in common life, is also an abomination to the Lord? And that it can have no place in any thing we say or do, but so far as we forget God? O watch against it in every place, every moment, that you may every moment see and love God; and consequently, at all times and in all places, worship him "in spirit and in truth."

My brethren, permit me to add a few words, in tender love to your souls. Do not you lean too much on the spirit and power which you believe rested upon your Forefathers? Suppose it did; will that avail you, if you do not drink into the same spirit? And how evident is this! That whatever ye once were, ye are now shorn of your strength. Ye are weak and become like other men. The Lord is well nigh departed from you. Where is now the spirit, the life, the power? Be not offended with my plain dealing, when I beseech you who are able to weigh things calmly, to open your eyes and see multitudes even in the church, pursuing, yea, and attaining the substance of spiritual life, and leaving unto you the shadow. Nay, a still greater evil is before you; for if ye find not some effectual means to prevent it, your rising generation will utterly cast off the shadow as well as the substance.

11. There is an abundantly greater difference still, according to your own account, between us who profess ourselves Members of the Church of England, and you who are Members of the Church of Rome. But notwithstanding this, do you not agree with us in condemning the vices above recited? Profaneness, Drunkenness, Whoredom, Adultery, Theft, Disobedience to Parents, and such like? And how unhappily do you agree with us in practising the very vices which you condemn? And yet you acknowledge, (nay and frequently contend for this with a peculiar earnestness,) that every Christian is called to be "zealous of good works," as well as to "deny himself and take up his

cross daily." How then do you depart from your own principles, when you are gluttons, drunkards, or epicures? When you live at your ease, in all the elegance and voluptuousness of a plentiful fortune! How will you reconcile the being adorned with gold, arrayed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day, with the "denying yourselves and taking up your cross daily?" Surely while you indulge the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eye, and the pride of life, the excellent Rules of Self-denial that abound in your own Writers, leave you of all men most inexcusable.

12. Neither can this self-indulgence be reconciled, with the being zealous of good works. For by this needless and continual expense, you disable yourselves from doing good. You bind your own hands. You make it impossible for you to do that good which otherwise you might. So that you injure the poor in the same proportion as you poison your own souls. You might have clothed the naked; but what was due to them, was thrown away on your costly apparel. You might have fed the hungry, entertained the stranger, relieved them that were sick or in prison. But the superfluities of your own tables swallowed up that whereby they should have been profited. And so this wasting of your Lord's goods, is an instance of complicated wickedness; since hereby your poor brethren perish for whom Christ died.

I will not recommend to you either the writings or examples of those whom you account Heretics, (although some of these, if you could view them with impartial eyes, might provoke you to jealousy.) But, O! that God would write in your hearts the rules of self-denial and love, laid down by Thomas à Kempis! Or that you would follow, both in this and in good works, that burning and shining light of your own Church, the Marquis de Renty! Then would all who knew and loved the Lord rejoice to acknowledge you as the Church of the living God: when ye were zealous of every good word and work; and abstained from all appearance of evil: when it was hereby shewn that you

were filled with the Holy Ghost, delivered from all unholy tempers: when ye were all "unblamable and unrebukeable, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, shewing forth" to all Jews, Infidels, and Heretics, by your active, patient, spotless love of God and man, "the praises of him who had called you out of darkness into his marvellous light."

13. Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, suffer me to speak a few words to you also? you who do not allow, That Messiah the Prince is already come and cut off. However, you so far hear Moses and the Prophets, as to allow, 1. That "it is the inspiration of the Holy One, which giveth man understanding," and that all the true children of God are taught of God. 2. That the substance both of the Law and the Prophets, is contained in that one word, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself." And, 3. That the sure fruit of love is obedience, "ceasing from evil, and doing good."

And do you walk by this Rule? Have you yourself that inspiration of the Holy One? Are you taught of God? Hath he opened your understanding? Have you the inward knowledge of the Most High? I fear not. Perhaps you know little more, even of the meaning of the words than a Mahometan.

Let us go a little farther. Do you "love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your strength?" Can you say, "Whom have I in heaven but thee; and there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee?" Do you desire God at all? Do you desire to have any thing to do with him, till you can keep the world no longer? Are you not content so you enjoy the good things of the earth, to let God stand afar off? Only calling upon him now and then, when you cannot well do without him. Why then you do not love God at all, though you will sometimes condescend to use him. You love the world. This possesses your heart. This therefore is your god.

You renounce the God of your fathers, the God of Israel: You are still uncircumcised in heart. Your own conscience bears witness, you in this no more hear Moses and the Prophets, than you do Jesus of Nazareth.

14. From Moses and the Prophets it has been shewn, that your forefathers were "a faithless and stubborn generation; a generation which set not their hearts aright, and whose spirit cleaved not steadfastly unto God." And this you acknowledge yourselves. If you are asked, how is it that the promise is not fulfilled? Seeing the sceptre is long since departed from Judah, why is not Shiloh come? Your usual answer is, "Because of the sins of our fathers, God hath delayed his coming." Have you then reformed from the sins of your fathers? Are you turned unto the Lord your God? Nay, do ye not tread in the same steps? Except that single point of outward idolatry, what abomination did they ever commit, which you have not committed also? Which the generality of you do not commit still, according to your power? If, therefore, the coming of the Messiah was hindered by the sins of your forefathers, then, by the same rule, your continuance therein will hinder his coming to the end of the world.

"Brethren, my heart's desire, and prayer to God is," that he would "gather the outcasts of Israel." And I doubt not, but when the fulness of the Gentiles is come in, then all Israel shall be saved. But mean time is there not great cause that ye should say with Daniel, "O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of face, as at this day, to the men of Judah, and unto all Israel. O Lord, we have sinned, we have rebelled against thee, neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God. Yet, O our God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes and behold our desolations: for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies. O Lord, hear! O Lord, forgive! O Lord, hearken and do! Defer not, for thine own sake; for thy city and thy people that are called by thy name."

15. I cannot conclude without addressing myself to you also, who do not admit either the *Jewish* or *Christian* Revelation. But still you desire to be happy: you own the essential difference between Vice and Virtue: and acknowledge, (as did all the wiser *Greeks* and *Romans*) that Vice cannot consist with Happiness. You allow, likewise, that gratitude and benevolence, self-knowledge and modesty, mildness, temperance, patience, and generosity, are justly numbered among Virtues; and that ingratitude and malice, envy and ill-nature, pride, insolence, and vanity, gluttony and luxury, covetousness and discontent, are Vices of the highest kind.

Now let us calmly inquire, how far your life is consistent with your principles. You seek happiness. But you find it not. You come no nearer it with all your labours. You are not happier than you were a year ago. Nay, I doubt you are more unhappy. Why is this, but because you look for happiness there, where you own it cannot be found? Indeed, what is there on earth which can long satisfy a man of understanding? His soul is too large for the world he lives in. He wants more room.

Æstuat infelix angusto limite Mundi,
Ut brevibus clausus Gyaris, parvaque Seripho.

He has already travelled through all which is called pleasure; diversions and entertainments of every kind. But among these he can find no enjoyment of any depth; they are empty, shallow, superficial things: they pleased for awhile, but the gloss is gone; and now they are dull and tasteless. And what has he next, Only the same things again? For this world affords nothing more. It can supply him with no change. Go, feed again: but it is upon one dish still. Thus,

Occidit miseros crambe repetita.

Yet what Remedy under the Sun!

16. The sounder judgment, the stronger understanding you have, the sooner you are sated with the world. And the more deeply convinced, all that cometh is vanity; foolish, insipid, nauseous. You see the foibles of men in

so much clearer a light, and have the keener sense of the emptiness of life. Here you are, a poor, unsatisfied inhabitant of an unquiet world; turning your weary eyes on this side, and on that side; seeking rest, but finding none. You seem to be out of your place: neither the persons nor things that surround you are such as you want. You have a confused idea of something better than all this; but you know not where to find it. You are always grasping for something which you cannot attain, no, not if you range to the uttermost parts of the earth.

But this is not all. You are not only negatively unhappy, as finding nothing whereon to stay the weight of your soul: but positively so, because you are unholy: you are miserable, because you are vicious. Are you not vicious? Are you then full of gratitude to him, who giveth you life, and breath, and all things? Not so; you rather spurn his gifts, and murmur at him that gave them. How often has your heart said, God did not use you well! How often have you questioned either his wisdom or goodness? Was this well done? What kind of gratitude is this? It is the best you are master of. Then take knowledge of yourself. Black ingratitude is rooted in your inmost frame. You can no more love God than you can see him; or than you can be happy without that love. Neither (how much soever you may pique yourself upon it) are you a lover of mankind. Can love and malice consist? Benevolence and envy? O do not put out your own eyes. And are not these horrid tempers in you? Do not you envy one man, and bear malice or ill-will to another I know you call these dispositions by softer names; but names change not the nature of things. You are pained that one should enjoy what you cannot enjoy yourself. Call this what you please, it is rank envy. You are grieved, that a second enjoys even what you have yourself; you rejoice in seeing a third unhappy. Do not flatter yourself: this is malice, venomous malice, and nothing else. And how could you ever think of being happy, with malice and envy in your

heart? Just as well might you expect to be at ease, while you hold burning coals in your bosom.

17. I intreat you to reflect, whether there are not other inhabitants in your breast, which leave no room for happiness there. May you not discover, through a thousand disguises, pride? Too high an opinion of yourself? Vanity, thirst of praise, even (who would believe it?) of the applause of knaves and fools? Uneveness or soreness of temper? Proneness to anger or revenge? Peevishness, fretfulness, or pining discontent? Nay, perhaps even covetousness—And did you ever think happiness could dwell with these? Awake out of that senseless dream. Think not of reconciling things incompatible. All these tempers are essential misery. So long as any of these are harboured in your breast, you must be a stranger to inward peace. What avails it you, if there be no other hell? Whenever these fiends are let loose upon you, you will be constrained to own,

"Hell is where'er I am: myself am hell!"

And can the Supreme Being love those tempers, which you yourself abhor in all but yourself? If not, they imply guilt as well as misery. Doubtless they do. Only inquire of your own heart. How often, in the mid career of your vice, have you felt a secret reproof, which you knew not how to bear, and therefore stifled it as soon as possible?

18. And did not even this point at an hereafter! a future state of existence? The more reasonable among you have no doubt of this; you hardly suppose the soul once disengaged, will dwell again in a house of clay. But how will your soul subsist without it? How are you qualified for a separate state? Suppose this earthly covering, this vehicle of organized matter, whereby you hold commerce with the material world, were now to drop off! Now, what would you do in the regions of immortality? You cannot eat or drink there. You cannot indulge either the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eye, or the pride of life. You love only worldly things; and they are gone, fled as smoke,

driven away for ever. Here is no possibility of sensual enjoyments; and you have a relish for nothing else. O what a separation is this, from all that you hold dear! What a breach is made, never to be healed!

But beside this, you are unholy: full of evil tempers: for you did not put off these with the body. You did not leave pride, revenge, malice, envy, discontent, behind you, when you left the world. And now you are no longer cheered by the light of the sun, nor diverted by the various objects: but those dogs of hell are let loose to prey upon your soul, with their whole, unrebated strength. Nor is there any hope, that your spirit will now ever be restored to its original purity: not even that poor hope of a purging fire, so elegantly described by the heathen Poet some ages before the notion was revived among the doctrines of the Romish Church.

—Aliæ tenduntur inanes
Suspensæ ad ventos; aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni—
Donec longa dies, perfecto temporis orbe,
Concretam exemit labem, purumque reliquit
Æthereum sensum atque aurai simplicis ignem.

19. What a great gulf then is fixed between you and happiness, both in this world and that which is to come! Well may you shudder at the thought! More especially when you are about to enter on that untried state of existence. For what a prospect is this, when you stand on the verge of life, ready to launch out into eternity! What can you then think? You see nothing before you. All is dark and dreary. On the very best supposition, how well may you address your parting soul in the words of dying Adrian:

"Poor, little, pretty, fluttering thing,
Must we no longer live together?
And dost thou prune thy trembling wing,
To take thy flight thou know'st not whither?

Thy pleasing vein, thy hum'rous folly
Is all neglected, all forgot;

And pensive, wavering melancholy,
Thou hop'st, thou fear'st, thou know'st not what."

"Thou know'st not what!" Here is the sting, suppose there were no other. To be thou knowest not what? Not for a month, or year, but through the countless ages of eternity! What a tormenting uncertainty must this be! What racking unwillingness must it occasion, to exchange even this known vale of tears, for the unknown valley of the shadow of death! "And is there no cure for this?" Indeed there is an effectual cure: even the knowledge and love of God. There is a knowledge of God which unvails eternity, and a love of God which endears it. That knowledge makes the great abyss visible; and uncertainty vanishes away. That love makes it amiable to the soul, so that fear has no more place! But the moment God says, by the welcome angel of death, "Come thou up hither," She

"Claps the glad wing and towers away,
And mingles with the blaze of day."

20. See ye not, what advantage every way, a Christian has over you? Probably the reason you saw it not before was, because you knew none but nominal Christians; men who profess to believe more (in their way of believing) but had no more of the knowledge or love of God than yourselves. So that with regard to real, inward religion, you stood upon even ground. And perhaps in many branches of outward religion, the advantage was on your side. May the Lord, the God of the Christians, either reform these wretches, or take them away from the earth! That lay this grand stumbling-block in the way of those who desire to know the will of God!

O ye who desire to know his will, regard them not! If it be possible, blot them out of your remembrance. They neither can nor will do you any good. O suffer them not to do you harm. Be not prejudiced against Christianity by those who know nothing at all of it. Nay, they condemn it, all real, substantial Christianity; they speak evil of the thing they know not. They have a kind of cant

word for the whole of the religion of the heart. They call it Enthusiasm.

I will briefly lay before you the ground of the matter, and appeal to you yourselves for the reasonableness of it.

21. What a miserable drudgery is the service of God, unless I love the God whom I serve! But I cannot love one whom I know not. How then can I love God till I know him? And how is it possible I should know God, unless he make himself known unto me? By analogy or proportion? Very good. But where is that proportion to be found? What proportion does a creature bear to his Creator? What is the proportion between finite and Infinite?

I grant the existence of the creatures demonstratively shews the existence of their Creator. The whole creation speaks that there is a God. But that is not the point in question. I know there is a God. Thus far is clear. But who will shew me what that God is. The more I reflect, the more convinced I am, that it is not possible for any or all the creatures, to take off the vail which is on my heart, that I might discern this unknown God; to draw the curtain back which now hangs between, that I may see him which is invisible. This vail of flesh now hides him from my sight. And who is able to make it transparent? So that I may perceive *through this glass*, God always before me, till I see him "face to face."

I want to know this great God who filleth heaven and earth: who is above, beneath, and on every side, in all places of his dominion, who just now besets me behind and before, and lays his hand upon me. And yet I am no more acquainted with him, than with one of the inhabitants of Jupiter or Saturn. O my friend, how will you get one step farther, unless God reveal himself to your soul?

22. And why should this seem a thing incredible to you? That God, a Spirit, and the Father of the spirits of all flesh, should discover himself to your spirit, which is itself the breath of God. *Divinæ Particula Auræ?* Any more than that material things should discover themselves to your

material eye. Is it any more repugnant to reason, that spirit should influence spirit, than that matter should influence matter? Nay, is not the former the more easily intelligible of the two? For there is the utmost difficulty in conceiving, how matter should influence matter at all. How that which is totally passive should act. Neither can we rationally account either for Gravitation, Attraction, or any natural motion whatsoever, but by supposing in all the finger of God, who alone conquers that *Vis inertiæ* which is essential to every particle of matter, and worketh in all.

Now if God should ever open the eyes of your understanding, must not the love of God be the immediate consequence? Do you imagine you can see God without loving him? Is it possible in the nature of things? *Si virtus conspiceretur oculis*, said the old heathen, *mirabiles amores excitaret sui*. How much more if you see him who is the Original Fountain, the great Archetype of all virtue, will that sight raise in you a love that is wonderful, such as the gay and busy world know not of!

23. What benevolence also, what tender love to the whole of the human kind, will you drink in, together with the love of God, from the unexhausted source of love! And how easy is it to conceive, that more and more of his image will be then transfused into your soul! That from disinterested love, all other divine tempers will, as it were, naturally spring? Mildness, gentleness, patience, temperance, justice, sincerity, contempt of the world; yea, whatsoever things are venerable and lovely, whatsoever are justly of good report.

And when you thus love God and all mankind, and are transformed into his likeness, then the commandments of God will not be grievous; you will no more complain, that they destroy the comfort of life. So far from it, that they will be the very joy of your heart; ways of pleasantness, paths of peace! You will experience here that solid happiness, which you had elsewhere sought in vain. Without servile fear or anxious care, so long as you continue on earth, you will gladly do the will of God here, as the angels

do it in heaven. And when the time is come that you should depart hence, when God says, "Arise and come away," you will pass with joy unspeakable out of the body, into all the fulness of God.

Now does not your own heart condemn you, if you call this religion *Enthusiasm?* O leave that to those blind zealots, who tack together a set of opinions and an outside worship, and call this poor, dull, lifeless thing, by the sacred name of *Christianity*. Well might you account *such Christianity* as this, a mere piece of empty pageantry, fit indeed to keep the vulgar in awe, but beneath the regard of a man of understanding. But in how different a light does it now appear! If there be such a religion as I have sketched out, must not every reasonable man see, there is nothing on earth to be desired in comparison of it?—But if any man desire this, let him ask of God: he giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not.

24. May you not ask, quite consistently with your principles, in some manner resembling this: O thou Being of beings, thou Cause of All, thou seest my heart; thou understandest all my thoughts. But how small a part of thy ways do I understand! I know not what is above, beneath, on every side. I know not my own soul. Only this I know, I am not what I ought to be. I see and approve the virtue which I have not. I do not love thee, neither am I thankful. I commend the love of mankind; but I feel it not. Thou hast seen hatred, malice, envy, in my heart. Thou hast seen anger, murmuring, discontent. These uneasy passions harrow up my soul. I cannot rest, while I am under this yoke. Nor am I able to shake it off. I am unhappy, and that thou knowest. Have compassion upon me, thou whose years do not fail! On me, who have but a short time to live. I rise up, and am cut down as a flower. I flee as it were a shadow. Yet a little while, and I return to dust, and have no more place under the sun. Yet I know thou hast made my soul to live for ever. But I know not where; and I am unwilling to try. I tremble, I am afraid to go thither, whence I shall not return. I stand

quivering on the edge of the gulf; for clouds and darkness rest upon it. O God! must I go always "creeping with terrors, and plunge into eternity with a peradventure!"

O thou Lover of men, is there no help in thee? I have heard (what indeed my heart cannot conceive) that thou revealest thyself to those that seek thee, and pourest thy love into their hearts: and that they who know and love thee, walk through the shadow of death and fear no evil. O that this were so! That there were such an unspeakable gift, given to the children of men! For then might I hope for it. O God, if there be, give it unto me! Speak, that I may see thee! Make thyself known unto me also in the manner that thou knowest! In any wise let me know thee and love thee, that I may be formed after thy likeness! That I may be love, as thou art love; that I may now be happy in thee; and when thou wilt, fall into the abyss of thy love, and enjoy thee through the ages of eternity!

A

FARTHER APPEAL

TO MEN OF

REASON AND RELIGION.

PART III.

And when he came near, he beheld the City, and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even Thou, at least in this thy Day, the Things which belong unto thy Peace! Luke xix. 41, 42.

I. 1. NOW, what can an impartial person think concerning the present state of religion in England? Is there a nation under the sun which is so deeply fallen from the very first principles of all religion? Where is the country, in which is found so utter a disregard to even Heathen Morality? Such a thorough contempt of justice and truth, and all that should be dear and honourable to rational creatures?

What species of vice can possibly be named, even of those that nature itself abhors, of which we have not had, for many years, a plentiful and still increasing harvest? What sin remains either in Rome or Constantinople, which we have not imported long ago, (if it was not of our own native growth,) and improved upon ever since? Such a complication of villanies of every kind, considered with all their aggravations; such a scorn of whatever bears the face of virtue; such *injustice*, *fraud*, and *falsehood:* above all, such *perjury*, and such a *method of law*, we may defy the whole world to produce. What multitudes are found

throughout our land, who do not even *profess* any religion at all! And what numbers of those who *profess much*, confute their profession by their *practice?* Yea, and perhaps by their exorbitant pride, vanity, covetousness, rapaciousness, or oppression, cause the very *name of Religion* to stink in the nostrils, of many (otherwise) *reasonable* men?

2. "However, we have many thousands still, of truly *virtuous* and *religious* men." Wherein does their *Religion* consist? In *Righteousness* and true *Holiness?* In *Love* stronger than death? Fervent *Gratitude* to God? And tender *Affection* to all his creatures? Is their religion the religion of the *Heart?* A renewal of the soul in the image of God? Do they *resemble* him they *worship?* Are they free from pride, from vanity, from malice and envy; from ambition and avarice, from passion and lust; from every uneasy and unlovely *temper?* Alas, I fear neither they (the greater part at least) nor *you*, know what *this Religion* means; or have any more notion of it, than the peasant that holds the plough, of the religion of a Gymnosophist. It is well if the *genuine Religion* of Christ has any more alliance with what you *call Religion*, than with the Turkish pilgrimages to Mecca, or the Popish worship of our Lady of Loretto. Have not you substituted in the place of the *Religion of the Heart*, something (I do not say equally *sinful*, but) equally vain, and foreign to the *worshipping* of God in *spirit and in truth?*—What else can be said even of *Prayer (public or private)* in the manner wherein you generally perform it? As a thing of *course*, running round and round, in the same dull track, without either the *knowledge* or *love* of God? Without one heavenly *temper*, either attained or improved? O what mockery of God is this!

And yet even *this Religion*, which can do you no good, may do you much harm. Nay, it is plain, it does: it daily increases your *Pride*, as you measure your goodness by the *number* and *length* of your performances. It gives you a deep *contempt* of those who do not come up to the full *Tale* of your virtues. It inspires men with a *zeal*, which is the

very fire of hell, furious, bitter, implacable, unmerciful; often to a degree that extinguishes all compassion, all good nature and humanity. Insomuch that the execrable *fierceness* of spirit, which is the natural fruit of such a Religion, hath many times, in spite of all ties, divine and human, broke out into open violence, into rapine, murder, sedition, rebellion, civil war, to the desolation of whole cities and countries.

Tantum hæc *Religio potuit suadere malorum!*

3. Now if there be a God, and one that is not a mere idle spectator of the things that are done upon the earth, but a rewarder of men and nations according to their works, what can the event of these things be? It was reasonable to believe, that he would have risen long ago, and maintained his own cause, either by sending the famine or pestilence among us, or by pouring out his fury in blood. And many wise and holy men have frequently declared, that they daily expected this, that they daily looked for the patience of God to give place, and judgment to rejoice over mercy.

4. Just at this time, when we wanted little of "filling up the measure of our iniquities," two or three Clergymen of the Church of England began vehemently to *call sinners to repentance.* In two or three years they had sounded the alarm, to the utmost borders of the land. Many thousands gathered together to hear them; and in every place where they came, many began to shew such a concern for religion, as they never had done before. A stronger *impression* was made on their minds, of the importance of things eternal, and they had more earnest *desires* of serving God, than they had ever had from their earliest childhood. Thus did God begin to draw them toward himself with the cords of love, with the bands of a man.

Many of these were in a short time deeply *convinced* of the *number* and *heinousness* of their *sins.* They were also made thoroughly sensible of those *tempers,* which are justly hateful to God and man, and of their utter *ignorance* of God, and entire *inability,* either to know, love, or serve him. At the same time, they saw in the strongest light, the

insignificancy of their *outside Religion:* nay, and often confessed it before God, as the most abominable *hypocrisy*. Thus did they sink deeper and deeper into that *Repentance*, which must ever precede *Faith* in the Son of God. And from hence sprung "fruits meet for repentance." The drunkard commenced sober and temperate; the whoremonger abstained from adultery and fornication; the unjust from oppression and wrong. He that had been accustomed to curse and to swear, for many years, now swore no more. The sluggard began to work with his hands, that he might eat his own bread. The miser learned to deal his bread to the hungry, and to cover the naked with a garment. Indeed the whole form of their life was changed. They had *left off doing evil, and learned to do well.*

5. But this was not all. Over and above this *outward change*, they began to experience *inward* religion: "The love of God was shed abroad in their hearts," which they continue to enjoy to this day. They love him "because he first loved us," and with-held not from us his Son, his only Son. And this love constrains them to love all mankind, all the children of the Father of heaven and earth, and inspires them with every holy and heavenly temper, the whole mind that was in Christ. Hence it is that they are now uniform in their behaviour, unblamable in all manner of conversation. And in whatsoever state they are, they have learned therewith to be content: insomuch that now they can "in every thing give thanks:" they more than patiently acquiesce, they rejoice and are exceeding glad, in all God's dispensations toward them. For as long as they love God, (and that love no man taketh from them,) they are always happy in God. Thus they calmly travel on through life, being never weary nor faint in their minds, never repining, murmuring, or dissatisfied, casting all their care upon God, till the hour comes that they should drop this covering of earth, and return unto the great Father of spirits. Then especially it is, that they "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." You who credit it not, come and see. See these living and dying Christians.

"Happy while on earth they breathe;
Mightier joys ordained to know,
Trampling on sin, hell, and death,
To the third heaven they go!"

Now if these things are so, what reasonable man can deny, (supposing the Scriptures to be true,) that God is now visiting this nation, in a far other manner than we had cause to expect? Instead of pouring out his fierce displeasure upon us, he hath made us yet another tender of mercy: so that even when "sin did most abound, grace hath much more abounded."

6. Yea, "the grace of God which bringeth salvation," present salvation from inward and outward sin, hath abounded of late years in such a degree, as neither we nor our fathers had known. How extensive is the change which has been wrought on the minds and lives of the people! Know ye not that the sound is gone forth into all the land? That there is scarcely a city or considerable town to be found, where some have not been roused out of the sleep of death, and constrained to cry out, in the bitterness of their souls, "What must I do to be saved?" That this *religious concern* has spread to every age and sex; to most orders and degrees of men? To abundance of those in particular, who in time past, were accounted monsters of wickedness, "drinking in iniquity like water," and committing all "uncleanness with greediness."

7. In what age has such a work been wrought, considering the *swiftness* as well as the *extent* of it? When have such *numbers* of sinners, in so *short* a time, been recovered from the error of their ways? When hath religion, I will not say since the Reformation, but since the time of Constantine the Great, made so large a progress in any nation, within so small a space? I believe, hardly can either ancient or modern history, supply us with a parallel instance.

8. Let understanding men observe also the *depth* of the work, so *extensively* and *swiftly* wrought. It is not a slight or superficial thing: but multitudes of men have been so

thoroughly *convinced of sin*, that their "bones were smitten asunder," as it were with a "sword dividing the very joints and marrow." Many of these have been shortly after so filled with "peace and joy in believing," that whether they were in the body, or out of the body, they could scarcely tell. And in the power of this faith they have trampled under foot, whatever the world accounts either terrible or desirable: having evidenced in the severest trials, so fervent a love to God, so invariable and tender a good-will to mankind, particularly to their enemies, and such a measure of all the fruits of holiness, as were not unworthy the Apostolic Age. Now so deep a repentance, so firm a faith, so fervent love and unblemished holiness, wrought in so many persons, within so short a time, the world has not seen for many ages.

9. No less remarkable is the *Purity* of the Religion which has extended itself so *deeply* and *swiftly*. I speak particularly, with regard to the doctrines held by those among whom it is so extended. Those of the Church of England, at least, must acknowledge this. For where is there a body of people in the realm, who, number for number, so closely adhere to what our Church delivers as pure doctrine? Where are those who have approved and do approve themselves more *orthodox*, more sound in their opinions? Is there a Socinian or Arian among them all? Nay, were you to recite the whole catalogue of heresies, enumerated by Bishop Pearson, it might be asked, Who can lay any one of these to their charge?

Nor is their Religion more *pure* from *heresy*, than it is from *superstition*. In former times, wherever an unusual concern for the things of God had appeared, on the one hand, *strange and enormous opinions* continually sprung up with it; on the other, a *zeal* for things which were no part of religion, as though they had been essential branches of it. And many have laid as great (if not greater) stress on trifles, as on the weightier matters of the law. But it has not been so in the present case. No stress has been laid on any thing, as though it were necessary to salvation, but

what is undeniably contained in the word of God. And of the things contained therein, the stress laid on each, has been in proportion to the nearness of its relation, to what is there laid down as the sum of all, the love of God and our neighbour. So *pure* from *superstition*, so thoroughly *scriptural* is that Religion, which has lately spread in this nation.

10. It is likewise *rational* as well as *scriptural;* it is as *pure* from *Enthusiasm*, as from *Superstition*. It is true, the contrary has been continually *affirmed*. But to *affirm* is one thing, to *prove* is another. Who will *prove*, that it is *Enthusiasm* to *love* God? Even though we love him with all our heart? To *rejoice* in the sense of his love to us? To *praise* him even with all our strength? Who is able to *make good* this charge, against the *love* of *all mankind?* Or, laying rhetorical flourishes aside, to come close to the question, and *demonstrate*, That it is *Enthusiasm*, in every state in which we are, therewith to be *content?* I do but just touch on the *general heads*. Ye men of reason, give me a man, who, setting raillery and ill names apart, will maintain this by dint of *argument*. If not, own *this Religion* is the thing you seek; sober, manly, rational, divine: however exposed to the censure of those, who are accustomed to revile what they understand not.

11. It may be farther observed, the religion of those we now speak of, is entirely clear from *bigotry*. (Perhaps this might have been ranked with *superstition*, of which it seems to be only a particular species.) They are in no wise *bigotted to opinions*. They do indeed hold right opinions. But they are peculiarly cautious, not to rest the weight of Christianity there. They have no such overgrown fondness for any opinions, as to think those alone will make them Christians, or to confine their affection or esteem to those who agree with them therein. There is nothing they are more fearful of than this, lest it should steal upon them unawares. Nor are they *bigotted* to any particular branch, even of practical religion. They desire indeed to be exact in every jot and tittle, in the very smallest points of *Chris-*

tian practice. But they are not attached to one point more than another; they aim at uniform, universal obedience. They contend for nothing *trifling*, as if it were important; for nothing *indifferent*, as if it were necessary; for nothing *circumstantial*, as if it were essential to Christianity; but for every thing in its own order.

12. Above all, let it be observed, that this Religion has no mixture of *vice* or *ungodliness*. It gives no man of any rank or profession, the least licence to sin. It makes no allowance to any person, for ungodliness of any kind. Not that all who follow after have attained this, either are already perfect. But however that be, they *plead* for no sin, either inward or outward. They condemn every kind and degree thereof, in themselves as well as in other men. Indeed most in themselves; it being their constant care, to bring those words home to their own case, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."

13. Yet there is not found among them that *bitter zeal*, in points either of small or of great importance, that spirit of *persecution*, which has so often accompanied the spirit of Reformation. It is an idle conceit, that the spirit of persecution is among the Papists only; it is wheresoever the devil, that old murderer, works; and he still "worketh in all the children of disobedience." Of consequence, all the children of disobedience, will, on a thousand different pretences, and in a thousand different ways, so far as God permits, persecute the children of God. But what is still more to be lamented is, that the children of God themselves, have so often used the same weapons and persecuted others, when the power was in their own hands.

Can we wholly excuse those venerable men, our great Reformers themselves, from this charge? I fear not, if we impartially read over any History of the Reformation. What wonder is it then, that when the tables ware turned, Bishop Bonner or Gardiner should make reprisals! That they should measure to others (indeed "good measure, shaken together") what had before been measured to them? Nor is it strange, when we consider the single case of Joan

Boucher, that God should suffer those (otherwise) holy men, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Ridley, and Bishop Latimer, to drink of the same cup with her.

14. But can you find any tincture of this in the case before us? Do not all who have known the love of God, know "what spirit they are of?" And that "the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them?" Do they approve of the using any kind or degree of *violence*, on any account or pretence whatsoever, in matters of *Religion?* Do they not hold the *right* every man has to judge *for himself*, to be sacred and inviolable? Do they allow any method of bringing even those who are the farthest out of the way, who are in the grossest errors, to the knowledge of the truth, except the methods of Reason and Persuasion? Of love, patience, gentleness, long-suffering? Is there any thing in their *practice* which is inconsistent with this their constant *profession?* Do they in fact hinder their own relations or dependents from worshipping God according to their own *conscience?* When they believe them to be in an error, do they use force of any kind, in order to bring them out of it? Let the instances, if there are such, be produced. But if no such are to be found, then let all reasonable men who believe the Bible, own, that a work of God is wrought in our land: and such a work, (if we survey in one view the *extent* of it, the *swiftness* with which it is spread, the *depth* of that Religion which was so swiftly diffused, and its *purity* from all corrupt mixtures,) as it must be acknowledged, cannot be easily paralleled, in all these concurrent circumstances, by any thing that is found in the English Annals, since Christianity was first planted in this island.

II. 1. And yet those, "who can discern the face of the sky, cannot discern the signs of the times." Yet those who are esteemed wise men, do not know that God is now reviving his work upon earth. Indeed concerning some of these the reason is plain; they *know* not, because they *think* not of it. Their thoughts are otherwise employed; their minds are taken up with things of quite a different

nature. Or, perhaps they may think of it a *little* now and then, when they have nothing else to do; but not seriously, or deeply; not with any closeness or attention of thought. They are too much in haste to *weigh* the facts whereof we speak, and to draw the just inference therefrom: nor is the conviction which they may sometimes feel suffered to sink into their hearts; but things that have a larger share in their affections soo destroy the very traces of it.

2. True it is, that there are some who think more deeply, who are accustomed to consider things from the foundation, and to lay circumstances together, that they may judge of nothing before they have full evidence: and yet even some of these appear to be *in doubt*, concerning the present work. Now, supposing it to be a work of God, how can this be accounted for? That they who so diligently inquire concerning it, do not know the time of their visitation? Perhaps because of the deeply-rooted *prejudice* which they brought with them to the inquiry, and which, still hanging on their minds, makes it scarce possible for them to form an impartial judgment. Perhaps, even a slight *prepossession* might occasion their stumbling on some of those rocks of *offence*, which, by the wise permission of God, always did and always will attend any Revival of his Work. Nay, it may be, their very caution was carried to excess. They would not judge before they had such evidence as the nature of the thing would *not* admit, or, at least, God did not see fit to give.

3. All this is very easy to conceive. But it may at first appear surprising, to find men of renown, men supposed to be endowed with knowledge, and with abilities of every kind, flatly, openly, peremptorily *denying*, that there has been any *unusual* work of God at all! Yea, a late eminent Writer goes farther yet, accounts it an instance of downright *Enthusiasm*, to *imagine*, that there is an *extraordinary* work now wrought upon the earth.* It avails not to say, "No, he does not deny this, but he denies it to be the

* Observations, Part III.

work of God." This is palpably trifling: for the work under consideration, is of such a nature (namely, the conversion of men from all manner of sin, to holiness of heart and life) that if it be at any time wrought at all, it must be the work of God: seeing it is God alone, and not any child of man, who is able to *destroy the works of the Devil.*

Yet neither is this difficult to be accounted for, if we consider things more closely: for the same *prejudice* which keeps some *in doubt*, may easily be conceived so to influence others, as to make them wholly *deny* the work of God. And this it may do in several ways: it may either bring them to question the facts related, and hinder their endeavouring to be more fully informed: or prevent their drawing the inferences from those facts, as they would otherwise see to be plain and undeniable. Yea, and it will give ten-fold weight to the offences which must come, so as to over-balance all evidence whatsoever.

4. This also may account for the behaviour of those, who not content to suspend their judgment, or to *deny* the work of God, go farther still, even to the length of *contradicting* and *blaspheming*. Nay, some of these have expressed a deeper abhorrence, and shewn a stronger enmity against this, than they were ever known to do against Popery, Infidelity, or any Heresy whatsoever. Some have *persecuted* the *instruments* whom it pleased God to use herein, only *not to the death;* and others have treated in the same manner, all those whom they termed their *followers*. A few instances of this it may be proper to mention, out of very many which might be recited.

5. On the 20th of June, 1743, a great multitude of people gathered together, chiefly from Walsal, Darlaston, and Bilston, in Wednesbury Church-yard, Staffordshire. They went from thence (after by sounding a horn they had gathered their whole company together) to Mr. Eaton's house, in the middle of the town, who was at that time *Constable*. He went to the door with his Constable's staff, and began reading the Act of Parliament against Riots; but the stones flew so thick about his head, that he was

forced to leave off reading and retire. They broke all his windows, the door of his house, and a large clock in pieces. They went then to above fourscore other houses, in many of which there were not three panes of glass left.

5. About Whitsuntide, 1743, a mob arose at Darlaston, (near Wednesbury) and broke all the windows (beside spoiling many of their goods) of Joshua Constable, John Cotterel, Thomas Butler, Thomas Wilkinson, Aaron Longmore, William Powell, Ann Evans, Walter Carter, Samuel Carter, and Thomas Wilks.

Edward Martin, Ann Low, Joan Fletcher, Edward Horton, Mumford Wilks, Joshua Yardly, and Robert Deacon, had all their windows broken twice.

James Foster, Widow Hires, and Jonathan Jones, had their windows broken, and money extorted to save their houses. James Foster and Joice Wood had their windows broken, and their goods broken and spoiled. Joseph Spittle had his windows broken, his house broken open, some goods spoiled and some taken away. William Wood, had his windows broken twice, and himself was compelled to go along with the rabble.

Elizabeth Lingham, a widow with five children, had her goods spoiled, her spinning wheel (the support of her family) broken; and her *Parish Allowance* reduced from 2s. and 6d. to 1s. and 6d. a week.

Valentine Ambersley had his windows broken twice, and his wife, big with child, beaten with clubs.

George Wynn had his windows and goods broken, and to to save his house, was forced to give them drink.

Thomas Day had his windows and goods broken, and was forced to remove from the town.

Joseph Stubbs had his windows broken twice, and his wife so frightened, that she miscarried.

7. On June 20, 1743, John Baker, at the head of a large mob, came to the house of Jonas Turner, at West-Bromwich near Wednesbury, and asked him, "whether he would *keep from these men* that went preaching about, and go to the Church?" He answered, "*I do go to the Church.*

But I never see any of you there." Presently one Daniel Oniens with a great club, broke great part of the window at one blow. Others laid hold of him, and dragged him about sixty yards, before he could get loose from them. Afterwards they broke all his windows, and threw into his house abundance of stones, to break his goods.

About four in the afternoon they came to the house of Widow Turner of West-Bromwich. They threw in the bricks and stones so fast, that she was forced to open the door and run out among them. One of her daughters cried out, "My mother will be killed!" On which they fell to throwing stones at her. She ran into a neighbour's house, but before she could shut the door, they broke the bottom off with a brick end. They followed her other daughter with stones, and one with a great stake. She ran into another house, much frightened, expecting to be murdered. The Widow asked, "How can you come and abuse us thus?" On which, one came with a large club, and swore, "if she spoke another word, he would knock her on the head, and bury her in the ditch." Then he went and broke all the glass that was left. The same they did to many of the neighbouring houses.

8. On the 19th of June, James Yeoman, of Walsal, saw Mary Bird in her father's house at Wednesbury, and swore, "by G— you are there now: but we will kill you tomorrow." Accordingly he came with a mob the next day; and after they had broken all the windows, he took up a stone, and said, "now by G— I will kill you." He threw it and struck her on the side of the head. The blood gushed out, and she dropped down immediately.

The same day, they came to John Turner's house, and after they had broken all the windows, casements, and cieling, one of them cried out, "I suppose now you will go to your dear Jesus's wounds and see them opened for you." Another of them took Mr. Hands, of Wednesbury, by the throat, swore he would be the death of him, gave him a great swing round, and threw him upon the ground. As soon as he rose, one Equal Baker gave him a blow on the

eye, and knocked him down again. In about half an hour the mob came to his house, and broke all the windows, except about twenty panes. The kitchen windows they cleared, lead, bars, and all, broke the window-posts, and threw them into the house. The shop was shut up (he being an Apothecary:) but they quickly broke it open, broke all the pots and bottles in pieces, and destroyed all his medicines. They broke also the shelves and drawers in the shop to pieces, and many of his household goods.

In the latter end of June, John Griffiths, of Wednesbury, and Francis Ware, went to Mr. D. Justice of the Peace. They told him the condition they and their neighbours were in, their houses broken, and their goods spoiled. He replied, "I suppose you follow these Parsons that come about. I will neither meddle nor make."

9. On January 13, 1743-4, the mob rose again at Darlaston, broke all the windows of all who *followed this Way*, (except two or three who bought themselves off) broke open several houses, and took what they liked, the people belonging to them being fled for their lives. About the same time the Reverend Mr. E—— came to Darlaston; and meeting some others at Thomas Forshew's, they drew up a writing, and Nicholas Winspur, the Crier of the town, gave public notice, "that all the people of the Society must come to Mr. Forshew's, and sign it; or else their houses would be pulled down immediately." It was to this effect, "that they would never read, or sing, or pray together, or hear these Parsons any more." Several signed this through fear. They made every one who did, lay down a penny—*To make the mob drink.*

About Candlemas, the wife of Joshua Constable, of Darlaston, was going to Wednesbury, when a mob met her in the road, threw her down several times, and abused her in a manner too horrible to write. A warrant was procured for some of these. But one of them only was carried before Mr. G——, who came back and told his companions, that the Justice said, "that they might go home about their business." On this the mob rose again, came to Joshua's

house, and destroyed all the goods therein. They likewise broke and spoiled all his shop tools, threw the tiles off the roof of the house, and pulled down one room, the joist of which they carried away with them. All his gun-locks they took away; they tore in pieces all his wife's linen, cut the bed and bedstead, so that it was good for nothing, and tore her Bible and Common-prayer Book all to pieces. She and her husband retired to another house. But one telling the mob they were there, they swore, "they would tear it down immediately, if the man let them stay any longer." So they went out into the frost and snow, not knowing where to lay their heads.

10. On Tuesday, Jan. 31, 1743-4, Henry Old came to John Griffith's house, saying, "if he did not leave *following this Way*, he had a hundred men at his command, who should come and pull his house down." Soon after he brought some with him; but the neighbours gave him money, and sent him away for that time.

Monday, Feb. 6, between seven and eight at night, came part of the same company. Hearing them afar off, John and his wife fastened the door, and left the house. Some of the neighbours going in soon after found them destroying all they could. Two chairs and several bundles of linen were laid upon the fire. After they had destroyed what they could, they loaded themselves with clothes and meat, and went their way. The same day public notice was given at Walsal, by a paper fixed up there, "That all who designed to assist in breaking the windows, and plundering the houses of the *Methodists* at Wednesbury, should be ready at ten o'clock, the next morning, on the Church-Hill."

11. The next morning, Feb. 7, (being Shrove-Tuesday) about half an hour after ten, great numbers of men were gathered on the Church-Hill. Thence they marched down, some armed with swords, some with clubs, and some with axes. They first fell upon Benjamin Watson's house, and broke many of the tiles, and all the windows. Next they came to Mr. Addinbrook's, broke a fine clock, with many

of his goods, and stole all the things they could carry away. The next house was Jane Smith's, whose windows they broke, with what little goods she had. The next was Mr. Bird's, where they destroyed every thing they found, except what they carried away; cutting the beds in pieces, as they did all the beds which they could any where find. Thence they went to Mr. Edge's house: he was ill of a fever; so, for a sum of money, they past it over. The next house was Mr. Hand's. They broke all his counters, boxes, and drawers, and all (except some bedsteads) that axe or hammer could break. They spilt all his drugs and chymical medicines, and stole every thing they could carry, even all his and his wife's wearing apparel, beside what they had on.

12. Mr. Eaton's house was next. They broke all his windows, and all his inside doors in pieces, cut the lead off his house, destroyed or stole whatever they could lay their hands on. Some Gentlemen offered to stop them, if he would sign a paper, implying, "That he would never hear these Parsons more." But he told them, "He had felt already what a wounded conscience was; and by the grace of God he would wound his conscience no more." After they had done at Mr. Eaton's, they plundered several other houses in Wednesbury and West-Bromwich. It is scarce possible to describe the outrages they committed. Only they left them they plundered alive. While they were plundering John Turner's house, he waded through the brook, to try if he could save some of his goods, which one David Garrington was carrying away. Upon which Garrington told him, "It would be the same here as it was in Ireland, for there would be a massacre very quickly. And he wished it was now."

13. About eleven o'clock, Sarah the wife of John Sheldon, being told, the mob was coming to her house, went and met them at the gate. She asked John Baker, their Captain, "What they were come for?" He answered, "If she would have nothing more to do with those people, not a pennyworth of her goods should be hurt." She made

to reply. Then they broke the door open, and began breaking and plundering the goods. One coming out with a fire-shovel, she begged him, "not to take that away." He swore, if she spoke another word, he would beat her brains out.

John Sheldon was this while helping Thomas Parkes to hide his goods, though he knew by the noise they were breaking his own to pieces. Between two and three he came to his house with William Sitch. William asked Sarah, how she did? Saying, "For his part, he took joyfully the spoiling of his goods." She answered, that "seeing so much wickedness, she could not rejoice; but she blessed God she could bear it patiently, and found not the least anger in her." John Sheldon seeing the spoil they had made, smiled and said, "Here is strange work." His wife told him, "if she had complied with their terms, not one pennyworth would have been hurt." He replied, "That if she had complied to deny the Truth, and he had found his goods whole on that account, he should never have been easy as long as he lived; but he blessed God that she had rather chosen to suffer wrong." The mob continued to rise for six days together. The damage they did in and about Wednesbury, at the very lowest computation, amounted to five hundred and four pounds, seventeen shillings.

Wednesday, October 19, 1743, I came to Birmingham, in my way to Newcastle. Thursday, October 20, several persons from Wednesbury earnestly desired me to call there. I yielded to their importunity, and went. I was sitting and writing at Francis Ward's, in the afternoon; when the cry arose, "That the Darlaston mob had beset the house." I called together those that were in the house, and prayed, that God would *scatter the people that delight in war*. And it was so: one went one way, and one another; so that in half an hour the house was clear on every side. But, before five, they returned with greater numbers. The cry of all was, "Bring out the Minister!" I desired one to bring the Captain of the mob into the house. After a few words

interchanged, the lion was as a lamb. I then desired him to bring in one or two more of the most angry of his companions. He did so; and in two minutes, their minds were changed too. I then bade them who were in the room make way, that I might go out among the people. As soon as I was in the midst of them I said, "Here I am: what do you want with me?" Many cried out, "We want you to go with us to the Justice." I told them, "That I will with all my heart." So I walked before, and two or three hundred of them followed to Bentley-Hall, two miles from Wednesbury. But a servant came out and told them, "Justice Lane was not to be spoken with." Here they were at a stand, till one advised to go to Justice Persehouse, at Walsal. About seven we came to his house; but he also sent word, "That he was in bed and could not be spoken with." All the company were now pretty well agreed, to make the best of their way home; but we had not gone a hundred yards, when the mob of Walsal came pouring in like a flood. The Darlaston mob stood against them for awhile; but in a short time, some being knocked down, and others much hurt, the rest ran away, and left me in their hands. To attempt to speak was vain, the noise being like that of taking a city by storm: so they dragged me along till they came to the town, at a few hundred yards distance; where, seeing the door of a large house open, I endeavoured to go in: but a man, catching me by the hair, (my hat having been caught away at the beginning) pulled me back into the middle of the mob; who were as so many ramping and roaring lions. They hurried me from thence, through the main street, from one end of the town to the other. I continued speaking all the time to those within hearing, feeling no pain or weariness.

At the west end of the town, seeing a door half open, I made towards it, and would have gone in, but a gentleman in the shop would not suffer me, saying, "They would pull the house down, if I did." However, here I stood, and asked, "Are you willing to hear me speak?" Many cried out, "No, no; knock his brains out." Others said,

"Nay; but we will hear him speak first." I began asking, "What hurt have I done you? Whom among you have I wronged in word or deed?" And continued speaking till my voice failed. Then the floods lifted up their voice again; many crying out, "Bring him away, bring him away!"

Feeling my strength renewed, I spoke again, and broke out aloud into prayer. And now, one of the men who had headed the mob before, turned and said, "Sir, follow me: not a man shall touch the hair of your head." Two or three more confirmed his words. At the same time the Mayor (for it was he that stood in the shop) cried out, "For shame, for shame; let him go." An honest butcher spoke to the same effect: and seconded his words by laying hold on four or five one after another, who were running on the most fiercely. The people then dividing to the right and left, those three or four men who had spoken before, took me between them, and carried me through the midst; bitterly protesting, "They would knock down any that touched him." But on the bridge the mob rallied again; we therefore went on one side, over a mill-dam, and thence through the meadows, till a little after ten, God brought me safe to Wednesbury, having lost only a part of my waistcoat, and a little skin from one of my hands.

I believe every reasonable man will allow, that nothing can possibly excuse these proceedings: seeing they are open, bare-faced violations both of justice and mercy, and of all laws divine and human.

III. 1. I suppose no *Protestant* will undertake to defend such proceedings, even towards the vilest miscreants. But abundance of *excuses* have been made, if not for *opposing* it thus, yet for *denying* this work to be of God, and for not acknowledging the time of our visitation.

1. Some allege, that the *Doctrines* of these men are *false*, *erroneous*, and *enthusiastic*: that they are *new*, and unheard of till of late: that they are Quakerism, Fanaticism, Popery.

This whole pretence has been already cut up by the

roots; it having been shewn at large, that every branch of this doctrine, is the plain doctrine of Scripture, interpreted by our own Church. Therefore it cannot be either *false* or *erroneous*, provided the Scripture be true. Neither can it be *enthusiastic*, unless the same epithet belongs to our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy. Nor yet can these doctrines be termed *new*: no newer at least than the reign of Queen Elizabeth; not even with regard to the way of expression, or the manner wherein they are proposed. And as to the substance, they are more ancient still; as ancient not only as the Gospel, as the times of Isaiah, or David, or Moses, but as the first Revelation of God to man. If therefore they were unheard of till of late, in any that is termed a Christian country, the greater guilt is on those, who, as Ambassadors of Christ, ought to publish them day by day.

Fanaticism, if it mean any thing at all, means the same with *enthusiasm*, or religious madness, from which (as was observed before) these doctrines are distant as far as the East from the West. However, it is a convenient word to be thrown out, upon any thing we do not like; because scarce one reader in a thousand, has any idea of what it means. If any part of this doctrine be held by the *Quakers*, there is the more reason to rejoice. I would to God they held it all: though the Doctrine itself, would be neither better nor worse for this. *Popery* in the mouth of many men means just nothing: or at most, "Something very horrid and bad." But *Popery*, properly speaking, is, *the distinguishing Doctrines* of the Church of Rome. They are summed up in the *Twelve Articles* which the Council of Trent added to the Nicene Creed. Now who can find the least connexion between any of these, and the Doctrines whereof we are speaking?

2. Others allege, "Their Doctrine is too strict. They make the way to heaven too narrow." And this is in truth the original objection, (as it was almost the only one for some time) and is secretly at the bottom of a thousand more, which appear in various forms. But do they make

the way to heaven any narrower, than our Lord and his Apostles made it? Is their Doctrine stricter than that of the Bible? Consider only a few plain texts. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength." "For every idle word which men shall speak, they shall give an account in the day of judgment." "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." If their Doctrine is stricter than this, they are to blame. But you know in your conscience, it is not. And who can be one jot less strict, without *corrupting the word of God?* Can any Steward of the mysteries of God be found faithful, if he change any part of that sacred Depositum? No. He can abate nothing, he can soften nothing. He is constrained to declare to all men, "I may not bring down the Scripture to your taste. You must come up to it, or perish for ever."

3. This is the real ground of that other popular cry, concerning "the Uncharitableness of these men." Uncharitable are they? In what respect? Do they not feed the hungry and clothe the naked? "No, that is not the thing. They are not wanting in this. But they are so uncharitable in judging! They think none can be saved, but those of their own way. They damn all the world beside themselves."

What do you mean? "They think none can be saved, but those of their own way." Most surely they do. For as there is but one heaven, so there is but one way to it; even the way of faith in Christ, (for we speak not of Opinions, or outward modes of worship,) the way of love to God and man, the Highway of Holiness. And is it uncharitable, to think or say, that none can be saved, but those who walk in this way? Was he then uncharitable, who declared, "He that believeth not shall be damned?" Or he that said, "Follow holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord?" And again: "Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be

burned, yet if I have not (αγαπην) *Charity*, *Love*, all this profiteth me nothing."

"But they damn all, you say, beside themselves." Damn all! What kind of word is this? They damn no man. None is able to damn any man, but the Lord and Judge of all. What you probably mean by that strange expression is, they declare that God condemns all, beside those who believe in Jesus Christ, and love him, and keep his commandments. And so must you also, or you sin against God, and your neighbour, and your own soul. But is there any uncharitableness in this? In warning sinners to flee from the wrath to come? On the contrary, not to warn a poor, blind, stupid wretch, that he is hanging over the mouth of hell, would be so inexcusable a want of charity, as would bring his blood upon our heads.

4. But there is no room for dispute, touching these doctrines in general, seeing our Lord gives you so plain a rule, by which you may easily and infallibly know, whether they be of God. "The tree is known by its fruit: either therefore make the tree good, and its fruit good: or else make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt." (Matt.xii.33.) Now what fruit does the tree before us bring forth? Look and see; believe your own eyes and ears. Sinners leave their sins. The servants of the devil become the servants of God. Is this good or evil fruit? That Vice loses ground, and Virtue, practical Religion, gains? O dispute no more. Know the tree by its fruit. Bow and own the finger of God.

5. But many who own these doctrines to be of God, yet cannot be reconciled to the instruments he hath made use of. A very common exception taken against these is (and was from the beginning) "that they are so young." Therefore (abundance of men have readily inferred) "this work cannot be of God."

Perhaps they are not so young as you conceive. Mr. Whitefield is now upwards of thirty: my brother is thirty-seven years of age. I have lived above forty-two years—

And a gentleman in Cornwall, for whom I often preach, has the merit of having lived threescore and seventeen years.

But, supposing the antecedent true, what a consequence is this? What shadow of Scripture have you to support it? Doth not God send by whom he will send? And who shall say to him, What dost thou? "These are too young; send elder men." What shadow of reason? Is it not possible, that a person of thirty or forty may have as true a judgment in the things of God, and as great a blessing attending his preaching, as one of fifty or fourscore? I wish you would explain yourself a little on this head:

Scire velim, verbo, *pretium quotus arroget annus?*

How old do you require a man to be, before God shall have leave to speak by his mouth? O my brethren, who could have believed any serious man would once have named such an argument as this? Seeing both Scripture and Reason teach, that God herein giveth account to none, of his ways. But he worketh by whomsoever he will work; he sheweth mercy by whom he will shew mercy.

6. "But there are only a few young heads." I cannot but observe here, what great pains have been taken, what diligence shewn, to make and to keep them few. What arts have not been used, to keep back those, of the Clergy in particular, who have been clearly convinced from time to time, that they ought to join hearts and hands in the work? On this occasion, it has been accounted meritorious to say all manner of evil of us falsely: to promise them whatever their hearts desired, if they would refrain from these men: and, on the other hand, to threaten them with heavy things, if ever they went among them more. So that how fully soever they were convinced, they could not act according to their conviction, unless they could give up at once all thought of preferment, either in Church or State; nay, all hope of even a Fellowship, or poor Scholarship in either University. Many also have been threatened, that if they went on in this way, what little they had should be

taken from them. And many have, on this very account, been disowned by their dearest friends and nearest relations. So that there was no possibility the number of these labourers should ever be increased at all, unless by those who could break through all these ties, who desired nothing in the present world, who counted neither their fortunes, nor friends, nor lives, dear unto themselves, so they might only keep a conscience void of offence towards God and towards men.

7. But what do you infer from their fewness? That because they are few, therefore God cannot work by them? Upon what Scripture do you ground this? I thought it was the same to him to save by many or by few. Upon what reason? Why cannot God save ten thousand souls by one man, as well as by ten thousand? How little, how inconsiderable a circumstance is number before God! Nay, is there not reason to believe, that whensoever God is pleased to work a great deliverance, spiritual or temporal, he may first say, as of old, The people are too many for me to give the Midianites into their hands? May he not purposely choose few as well as inconsiderable instruments, for the greater manifestation of his own glory? Very few, I grant, are the instruments now employed; yet a great work is wrought already. And the fewer they are by whom this large harvest hath hitherto been gathered in, the more evident must it appear to unprejudiced minds, That the work is not of man, but of God.

8. "But they are not only few, but unlearned also." This is another grievous offence; and is by many esteemed a sufficient excuse, for not acknowledging the work to be of God.

The ground of this offence is partly true. Some of those who now preach are unlearned. They neither understand the ancient languages, nor any of the branches of philosophy. And yet this objection might have been spared, by many of those who have frequently made it; because they are unlearned too (though accounted otherwise.) They have not themselves the very thing they require in others.

Men in general are under a great mistake with regard to what is called "the Learned World." They do not know, they cannot easily imagine, how little learning there is among them. I do not speak of abstruse learning; but of what all Divines, at least of any note, are supposed to have, viz. The knowledge of the Tongues, at least Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and of the common Arts and Sciences.

How few men of learning, so called, understand Hebrew! Even so far as to read a plain chapter in Genesis! Nay, how few understand Greek! Make an easy experiment. Desire that grave man who is urging this objection, only to tell you the English of the first paragraph that occurs in one of Plato's Dialogues! I am afraid we may go farther still. How few understand Latin! Give one of them an Epistle of Tully, and see how readily he will explain it without his Dictionary. If he can hobble through that, 'tis odds but a Georgick in Virgil, or a Satire of Persius sets him fast.

And with regard to the Arts and Sciences: how few understand so much as the general principles of Logic? Can one in ten of the Clergy (O grief of heart!) or of the Masters of Arts in either University, when an argument is brought, tell you even the Mood and Figure wherein it is proposed? Or complete an Enthymeme? Perhaps, you do not so much as understand the term: supply the premiss which is wanting, in order to make it a full Categorical Syllogism. Can one in ten of them demonstrate a Problem or Theorem in Euclid's Elements? Or define the common terms used in Metaphysics? Or intelligibly explain the first Principles of it? Why then will they pretend to that learning, which they are conscious to themselves they have not? Nay, and censure others who have it not, and do not pretend to it? Where are Sincerity and Candor fled?

It will easily be observed, that I do not depreciate Learning of any kind. The knowledge of the Languages is a valuable talent; so is the knowledge of the Arts and

Sciences. Both the one and the other may be employed to the glory of God, and the good of men. But yet I ask, Where hath God declared in his word, that he cannot, or will not make use of men that have it not? Has Moses, or any of the Prophets affirmed this? Or our Lord? Or any of his Apostles? You are sensible all these are against you. You know the Apostles themselves, all except St. Paul, were ανδρες αγραμματοι και ιδιωται· common, unphilosophical, unlettered men.

9. "What! Then you make yourselves like the Apostles." Because this silly objection has so often been urged, I will, for once, spend a few words upon it, though it does not deserve that honour. Why, must not every man, whether Clergyman, or Layman, be in some respects, like the Apostles, or go to hell? Can any man be saved, if he be not holy like the Apostles? A follower of them as they were of Christ? And ought not every Preacher of the Gospel, to be in a peculiar manner like the Apostles, both in holy tempers, in exemplariness of life, and in his indefatigable labours for the good of souls? Woe unto every Ambassador of Christ, who is not like the Apostles in this! In holiness; in making full proof of his ministry; in spending and being spent for Christ! We cannot, and therefore we need not be like them, in working outward miracles. But we may and ought, in working together with God for the salvation of men. And the same God who was always ready to help their infirmities, is ready to help ours also. He who made them workmen that needed not to be ashamed, will teach us also rightly to divide the word of truth. In this respect, likewise, in respect of his having help from God, for the work whereunto he is called, every Preacher of the Gospel is like the Apostles. Otherwise he is of all men most miserable.

10. And I am bold to affirm, that these unlettered men have help from God, for that great work, the saving souls from death; seeing he hath enabled, and doth enable them still, to turn many to righteousness. Thus hath he "destroyed the wisdom of the wise, and brought to nought

the understanding of the prudent." When they imagined they had effectually shut the door, and locked up every passage, whereby any help could come to two or three Preachers, weak in body as well as soul; who they might reasonably believe would, humanly speaking, wear themselves out in a short time: when they had gained their point, by securing (as they supposed) all the men of learning in the nation: *He that sitteth in heaven laughed them to scorn*, and came upon them by a way they thought not of. *Out of the stones he raised up* those who should beget children to Abraham. We had no more foresight of this than you. Nay, we had the deepest prejudices against it: untill we could not but own, that God gave wisdom from above to these unlearned and ignorant men; so that the work of the Lord prospered in their hands, and sinners were daily converted to God.

Indeed in the one thing which they profess to know, they are not ignorant men. I trust there is not one of them who is not able to go through such an examination, in substantial, practical, experimental Divinity, as few of our Candidates for holy Orders, even in the University (I speak it with sorrow and shame, and in tender love) are able to do. But, oh! what manner of examination, do most of those Candidates go through? And what proof are the Testimonials commonly brought (as solemn as the form is wherein they run) either of their piety or knowledge, to whom are intrusted those sheep which God hath purchased with his own blood!

11. "But they are Laymen. You seem to be sensible yourself, of the strength of this objection. For as many as you have answered, I observe you have never once so much as touched on this." I have not. Yet it was not distrust of my cause, but tenderness to you which occasioned my silence. I had something to advance on this head also: but I was afraid you could not bear it. I was conscious to myself, that some years since, to touch this point, was to touch the apple of my eye. And this makes me almost unwilling to speak now; lest I should shock the

prejudices I cannot remove. Suffer me, however, just to intimate to you some things, which I would leave to your farther consideration. The Scribes of old, who were the ordinary preachers among the Jews, were not Priests; they were not better than laymen. Yea, many of them were incapable of the Priesthood, being of the tribe of Simeon, not of Levi. Hence probably it was, that the Jews themselves never urge it as an objection to our Lord's preaching, (even those who did not acknowledge or believe, that he was sent of God in an extraordinary character,) that he was no priest after the order of Aaron. Nor indeed could be; seeing he was of the tribe of Judah. Nor does it appear, that any objected this to the Apostles. So far from it, that at Antioch in Pisidia, we find the Ruler of the Synagogue sending unto Paul and Barnabas, strangers just come into the city, "saying, Men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on," Acts xiii. 15.

If we consider these things, we shall be less surprised at what occurs in the 8th chapter of the Acts; "At that time there was a great persecution against the church, and they were all scattered abroad:" [i. e. all the church, all the believers in Jesus throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria,] (ver. 1.) "Therefore they that were scattered abroad, went every where preaching the word," (v. 4.) Now what shadow of reason have we to say, or think, that all these were *ordained* before they preached?

12. If we come to later times; Was Mr. Calvin ordained? Was he either Priest or Deacon? And were not most of those whom it pleased God to employ in promoting the Reformation abroad, laymen also? Could that great work have been promoted at all in many places, if laymen had not preached? And yet how seldom do the very Papists urge this, as an objection against the Reformation? Nay, as rigorous as they are in things of this kind, they themselves appoint, even in some of their strictest orders, that "if any lay brother believes himself called of God, to preach as a Missionary, the Superior of the Order, being informed thereof, shall immediately send him away."

In all Protestant churches, it is still more evident, that Ordination is not held a necessary prerequisite of preaching: for in Sweden, in Germany, in Holland, and, I believe, in every reformed Church in Europe, it is not only permitted, but required, that before any one is ordained, (before he is admitted even into Deacon's orders, wherever the distinction between Priests and Deacons is retained) he should publickly preach a year or more, *ad probandum facultatem*. And for this practice, they believe they have the authority of an express command of God: "Let these first be proved: then let them use the office of a Deacon being found blameless," 1 Tim. iii. 10.

13. "In England, however, there is nothing of this kind; no layman is permitted to speak in public." No! Can you be ignorant, that in a hundred churches they do it continually? In how many (particularly in the West of England) does the parish-clerk read one of the lessons? (In some he reads the whole service of the church, perhaps every Lord's day.) And do not other laymen constantly do the same thing, yea, in our very cathedrals? Which being under the more immediate inspection of the Bishops, should be patterns to all other churches.

Perhaps it will be said, "But this is not preaching." Yes, but it is, essentially such. For what is it to preach, but *prædicare Verbum Dei?* To publish the word of God? And this laymen do all over England; particularly under the eye of every Bishop in the nation.

Nay, is it not done in the Universities themselves? Who ordained that singing man at Christ-Church? Who is likewise utterly unqualified for the work, murdering every lesson he reads? Not even endeavouring to read it as the word of God, but rather as an old song! Such a layman as this, meddling at all with the word of God, I grant is a scandal to the English nation.

To go a step farther.—Do not the fundamental constitutions of the University of Oxford, the statutes, even as revised by Archbishop Laud, require every Bachelor of Arts, nine in ten of whom are laymen, to read three public

lectures in Moral Philosophy, on whatever subject he chooses? My subject, I well remember, was, the Love of God. Now, what was this but preaching?

Nay, may not a man be a Doctor of Divinity even in Oxford, though he never was ordained at all? The instance of Dr. Attwell, (late) Rector of Exeter College, is fresh in every one's memory.—These are a few of the considerations that may readily occur to any thinking man on this head. But I do not rest the cause on these. I believe it may be defended a shorter way.

14. It pleased God by two or three ministers of the Church of England, to call many sinners to repentance; who, in several parts, were undeniably turned from a course of sin, to a course of holiness. The ministers of the places where this was done, ought to have received those ministers with open arms; and to have taken them who had just begun to serve God, into their peculiar care; watching over them in tender love, lest they should fall back into the snare of the devil. Instead of this, the greater part spoke of those ministers, as if the devil, not God, had sent them. Some repelled them from the Lord's table: others stirred up the people against them, representing them even in their public discourses, as *Fellows not fit to live: Papists, Heretics, Traitors; Conspirators* against their *King* and *Country*.

And how did they watch over the sinners lately reformed? Even as a leopard watcheth over his prey. They drove some of them also from the Lord's table; to which, till now, they had no desire to approach. They preached all manner of evil concerning them, openly cursing them in the Name of the Lord. They turned many out of their work; persuaded others to do so too, and harrassed them all manner of ways. The event was, That some were wearied out, and so turned back to their vomit again. And then these good pastors gloried over them, and endeavoured to shake others by their example.

15. When the ministers by whom God had helped them before, came again to those places, great part of their work was to begin again, if it could be begun

again: but the relapsers were often so hardened in sin, that no impression could be made upon them. What could they do in a case of so extreme necessity? Where so many souls lay at stake? No clergyman would assist at all. The expedient that remained was, to find some one among themselves, who was upright of heart, and of sound judgment in the things of God: and to desire him to meet the rest as often as he could, in order to confirm them, as he was able, in the ways of God: either by reading to them, or by prayer, or by exhortation. God immediately gave a blessing hereto. In several places, by means of these plain men, not only those who had already begun to run well, were hindered from drawing back to perdition; but other sinners also, from time to time, were converted from the error of their ways.

This plain account of the whole proceeding, I take to be the best defence of it. I know no scripture which forbids making use of such help, in a case of such necessity. And I praise God who has given even this help to those poor sheep, when "their own shepherds pitied them not."

16. "But does not the Scripture say, 'No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that was called of God, as was Aaron?'" Nor do these. The *honour* here mentioned is the Priesthood. But they no more take upon them to be priests than to be kings. They take not upon them to administer the sacraments, an honour peculiar to the priests of God. Only according to their power, they exhort their brethren, to continue in the grace of God.

"But for these laymen to exhort at all, is a violation of all order." What is this order of which you speak? Will it serve instead of the knowledge and love of God? Will this order rescue those from the snare of the devil, who are now taken captive at his will? Will it keep them who are escaped a little way, from turning back into Egypt? If not, how should I answer it to God, if rather than violate I know not what order, I should sacrifice thousands of souls thereto? I dare not do it. It is at the peril of my own soul.

Indeed if by Order were meant, *True Christian Discipline*,

whereby all the living members of Christ are knit together in one, and all that are putrid and dead, immediately cut off from the body: this order I reverence; for it is of God. But where is it to be found? In what diocese? In what town or parish, within England or Wales? Are you Rector of a parish? Then let us go no farther. Does this Order obtain there? Nothing less. Your parishioners are a rope of sand. As few, (if any) of them are alive to God; so they have no connection with each other, unless such as might be among Turks or Heathens. Neither have you any power to cut off from that body, were it alive, the dead and putrid members. Perhaps you have no desire: but all are jumbled together without any care or concern of yours. It is plain then that what order is to be found, is not among you, who so loudly contend for it, but among that very people whom you continually blame, for their violation and contempt of it. The flock you condemn is united together in one body, by one spirit: so that "if one member suffers, all the members suffer with it, if one be honoured, all rejoice with it." Nor does any dead member long remain; but as soon as the hope of recovering it is past, it is cut off.

Now suppose we were willing to relinquish our charge, and to give up this flock into your hands; would you observe the same order, as we do now, with them and the other souls under your care? You dare not: because you have respect of persons. You fear the faces of men. You cannot; because you have not "overcome the world." You are not above the desire of earthly things. And it is impossible you should ever have any true order, or exercise any *Christian Discipline*, till you are wholly "crucified to the world," till you desire nothing more but God.

17. Consider this matter, I intreat you a little farther. Here are seven thousand persons (perhaps somewhat more) of whom I take care, watching over their souls as he that must give account. In order hereto it lies upon me (so I judge) at the peril of my own salvation, to know not only their names, but their outward and inward states, their difficulties

and dangers. Otherwise how can I know either how to guide them aright, or to commend them to God in prayer? Now if I am willing to make these over to you, will you watch over them in the same manner? Will you take the same care (or as much more as you please) of each soul as I have hitherto done? Not such *Curam Animarum* as you have taken these ten years in your own parish. Poor empty name! has not your parish been in fact, as much a sinecure to you as your prebend? Oh what account have you to give to the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls!

18. There is one more excuse for denying this work of God, taken from the Instruments employed therein: that is, "That they are wicked men." And a thousand stories have been handed about to prove it. But you may observe, their wickedness was not heard of, till after they went about doing good. Their reputation for honesty was till then unblemished. But it was impossible it should continue so, when they were publickly employed in "testifying of the world, that its deeds were evil." It could not be but the Scriptures should be fulfilled. "The servant is not above his Master. If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household?"

Yet I cannot but remind considerate men, in how remarkable a manner the wisdom of God has for many years guarded against this pretence, with respect to my brother and me in particular. Scarcely any two men in Great Britain, of our rank, have been so held out, as it were to all the world: especially of those who from their childhood had always loved and studiously sought retirement. And I had procured what I had sought; I was quite safe, as I supposed, in a little country town, when I was required to return to Oxford, without delay, to take the charge of some young gentlemen, by Dr. Morley, the only man then in England to whom I could deny nothing. From that time both my brother and I (utterly against our wills) came to be more and more observed and known, till we were more spoken of, than, perhaps, two so inconsiderable persons ever were before in the nation. To make us more

public still, as honest madmen at least, by a strange concurrence of providences, overturning all our preceding resolutions, we were hurried away to America. However, at our return from thence, we were resolved to retire out of the world at once; being sated with noise, hurry, and fatigue, and seeking nothing but to be at rest. Indeed for a long season, the greatest pleasure I had desired, on this side eternity was

Tacitum Sylvas inter reptare salubres,
Quærentem quicquid dignum sapiente bonoque.

And we had attained our desire. We wanted nothing. We looked for nothing more in this world, when we were dragged out again, by earnest importunity, to preach at one place and another, and another, and so carried on, we knew not how, without any design, but the general one, of saving souls, into a situation, which had it been named to us at first, would have appeared far worse than death.

19. What a surprising apparatus of Providence was here! And what stronger demonstrations could have been given, of men's acting from a zeal for God, whether it were according to knowledge or not? What persons could, in the nature of things, have been (antecedently) less liable to exception, with regard to their moral character, at least, than those the All-wise God had employed? Indeed I cannot devise what manner of men could have been more unexceptionable on all accounts. Had God endued us with greater natural or acquired abilities, that very thing might have been turned into an objection. Had we been remarkably defective, it would have been matter of objection on the other hand. Had we been Dissenters of any kind, or even Low-Church men, (so called,) it would have been a great stumbling-block in the way of those who are zealous for the Church. And yet had we continued in the impetuosity of our High-Church zeal, neither should we have been willing to converse with Dissenters, nor they to receive any good at our hands. Some objections were kept out of the way, by our known contempt of money and preferment: and others, by that rigorous strictness of life, which we

exacted, not of others, but ourselves only. Insomuch, that twelve or fourteen years ago, the censure of one who had narrowly observed us, (me, in particular,) went no farther than this:

"Does JOHN beyond his strength persist to go,
To his frail carcase literally foe?
Careless of health, as if in haste to die,
And lavish time to insure eternity!"

So that upon the whole, I see not what God could have done more in this respect which he hath not done. Or what Instruments he could have employed in such a work, who would have been less liable to exception.

20. Neither can I conceive how it was possible to do that work, the doing of which, we are still under the strongest conviction, is bound upon us at the peril of our own souls, in a less exceptionable manner. We have, by the grace of God, behaved not only with meekness, but with all tenderness towards all men; with all the tenderness which we conceived it was possible to use without betraying their souls. And from the very first, it has been our special care, to deal tenderly with our brethren of the Clergy. We have not willingly provoked them at any time; neither any *single* Clergyman. We have not sought occasion to publish their faults; we have not used a thousand occasions that offered. When we were constrained to speak something, we spake as little as we believed we could, without offending God: and that little, though in plain and strong words, yet as mildly and lovingly as we were able. And in the same course we have steadily persevered (as well as in earnestly advising others to tread in our steps) even though we saw that with regard to them, by all this we profited nothing; though we knew we were still continually represented as *implacable enemies to the Clergy*, as railers against them, as slanderers of them, as seeking all opportunities to blacken and asperse them. When a Clergyman himself has vehemently accused me of doing this, I bless God, he could not provoke me to do it. I still *kept my*

mouth as it were with a bridle, and committed my cause to a higher Hand.

21. The truth is, you impute that hatred to us, which is in your own breasts. (I speak not this of all the Clergy: God forbid! But let it fall on whom it concerns.) You, it is certain, have shewn the utmost hatred to us, and in every possible way: unless you were actually to beat us (of which also we are not without precedent) or to shoot us through the head. And if you could prevail upon others to do this, I suppose you would think you did God service. I do not speak without ground. I have heard with my own ears such sermons (in Staffordshire particularly) that I should not have wondered if as soon as we came out of the Church, the people had stoned me with stones. And it was a natural consequence of what that poor Minister had lately heard, at the Bishop's Visitation; as it was one great cause of the miserable riots and outrages which soon followed.

It is this, my brethren, it is your own preaching, and not ours, which sets the people against you. The very same persons, who are diverted with those sermons, cannot but despise you for them in their hearts: even those who on your authority believe most of the assertions which you advance. What then must they think of you, who know the greatest part of what you assert to be utterly false? They may pity and pray for you; but they can esteem you no other, than false witnesses against God and your brethren.

22. "But what need is there (say even some of a milder spirit) of this preaching in fields and streets? Are there not Churches enough to preach in?" No, my friend, there are not; not for *us* to preach in. You forget: we are not suffered to preach there; else we should prefer them to any places whatever. "Well, there are Ministers enough without you." Ministers enough, and Churches enough: for what? To reclaim all the sinners within the four seas? If there were, they would all be reclaimed. But they are not reclaimed. Therefore it is evident, there are not

Churches enough. And one plain reason why, notwithstanding all these Churches, they are no nearer being reclaimed is this: they never come into a Church; perhaps not once in a twelve-month, perhaps not for many years together. Will you say (as I have known some tender-hearted Christians) "then it is their own fault; let them die and be damned." I grant it is their own fault. And so it was my fault and yours, when we went astray, like sheep that were lost. Yet the Shepherd of Souls sought after us, and went after us into the wilderness. And "oughtest not thou to have compassion on thy fellow servants, as he had pity on thee?" Ought not we also to seek, as far as in us lies, and to save that which is lost?

Behold the amazing love of God to the outcasts of men! His tender condescension to their folly! They would regard nothing done in the usual way. All this was lost upon them. The ordinary preaching of the word of God, they would not even deign to hear. So the devil made sure of these careless ones. For who should pluck them out of his hand? Then God was moved to jealousy, and went out of the usual way to save the souls which he had made. Then over and above what was ordinarily spoken in his Name, in all the houses of God in the land, he commanded a voice to cry in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord. The time is fulfilled. The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Repent ye, and believe the gospel."

23. Consider coolly, if it was not highly expedient, that something of this kind should be? How expedient, were it only on the account of those poor sinners against their own souls, who (to all human appearance) were utterly inaccessible every other way! And what numbers of these are still to be found, even in or near our most populous cities! What multitudes of them were some years since, both in Kingswood, and the Fells about Newcastle! Who, week after week, spent the Lord's day, either in the ale-houses, or in idle diversions, and never troubled themselves about going to Church, or to any public worship at all! Now would you really have desired that these poor wretches

should have sinned on, till they dropped into hell? Surely you would not. But by what other means was it possible they should have been plucked out of the fire? Had the Minister of the parish preached like an angel, it had profited them nothing; for they heard him not. But when one came and said, "Yonder is a man preaching on the top of the mountain," they ran in droves to hear what he would say. And God spoke to their hearts. It is hard to conceive any thing else which could have reached them. Had it not been for Field-preaching, the uncommonness of which was the very circumstance that recommended it, they must have run on in the error of their way, and perished in their blood.

24. But suppose Field-preaching to be, in a case of this kind, ever so expedient, or even necessary, yet who will contest with us for this province?—May we not enjoy this quiet and unmolested? Unmolested, I mean by any competitors.—For who is there among you, brethren, that is willing (examine your own hearts) even to save souls from death at this price? Would not you let a thousand souls perish, rather than you would be the instrument of rescuing them thus? I do not speak now with regard to conscience, but to the inconveniences that must accompany it. Can you sustain them, if you would? Can you bear the summer sun to beat upon your naked head? Can you suffer the wintry rain or wind, from whatever quarter it blows? Are you able to stand in the open air, without any covering or defence, when God casteth abroad his snow like wool, or scattereth his hoar-frost like ashes? And yet these are some of the smallest inconveniences which accompany Field-preaching. For beyond all these, are the contradiction of sinners, the scoffs both of the great vulgar and the small; contempt and reproach of every kind; often more than verbal affronts, stupid, brutal violence, sometimes to the hazard of health, or limbs, or life. Brethren, do you envy us this honour? What I pray, would buy you to be a Field-Preacher? Or what, think you, could induce any man of common sense, to continue therein one year,

unless he had a full conviction in himself, that it was the will of God concerning him? Upon this conviction it is (were we to submit to these things on any other motive whatsoever, it would furnish you with a better proof of our distraction than any that has yet been found,) that we now do, for the good of souls, what you cannot, will not, dare not do. And we desire not that you should; but this one thing, we may reasonably desire of you; do not increase the difficulties which are already so great, that without the mighty power of God, we must sink under them. Do not assist in trampling down a little handful of men, who for the present stand in the gap, between ten thousand poor wretches and destruction, till you find some others to take their places.

25. Highly needful it is, that some should do this, lest those poor souls be lost without remedy. And it should rejoice the hearts of all who desire the kingdom of God should come, that so many of them have been snatched already from the mouth of the lion, by an uncommon (though not unlawful) way. This circumstance therefore is no just excuse, for not acknowledging the work of God. Especially, if we consider, that whenever it has pleased God to work any great work upon the earth, even from the earliest times, he hath stept more or less out of the common way: whether to excite the attention of a greater number of people, than might otherwise have regarded it; or to separate the proud and haughty of heart, from those of an humble, child-like spirit: the former of whom he foresaw, trusting in their own wisdom, would fall on that stone and be broken: while the latter, inquiring with simplicity, would soon know of the work, that it was of God.

26. "Nay (some say) but God is a God of wisdom. And it is his work, to give understanding. Whereas this man is one of them, and he is a fool. You see the fruits of their preaching." No, my friend, you do not. That is your mistake. A fool very possibly he may be. So it appears by his talking, perhaps writing too. But this is none of the fruits of our preaching. He was a fool before ever he

heard us. We found and are likely to leave him so. Therefore his folly is not to be imputed to us, even if it continued to the day of his death. As we were not the cause, so we undertake not the cure of disorders of this kind. No fair man, therefore, can excuse himself thus, from acknowledging the work of God.

Perhaps you will say, "He is not a natural fool neither. But he is so ignorant. He knows not the first principles of Religion." It is very possible. But have patience with him, and he will know them by and by. Yea, if he be in earnest to save his soul, far sooner than you can conceive. And in the mean time, neither is this an objection of any weight. Many, when they begin to hear us, may, without any fault of ours, be utter strangers to the whole of Religion. But this is no incurable disease. Yet a little while and they may become wise unto salvation.

Is the ignorance you complain of among this people (you who object to the people more than to their Teachers) of another kind? Do not they "know, how in meekness to reprove or instruct those that oppose themselves?" I believe what you say: all of them do not: they have not put on gentleness and long-suffering. I wish they had: pray for them that they may; that they may be mild and patient toward all men. But what if they are not? Sure you do not make this an argument that God hath not sent us? Our Lord came, and we come, "not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance:" passionate sinners, (such as these whereof you complain) as well as those of every other kind. Nor can it be expected they should be wholly delivered from their sin, as soon as they begin to hear his word.

27. A greater stumbling-block than this is laid before you, by those that say and do not. Such I take it for granted will be among us, although we purge them out as fast as we can: persons that talk much of Religion, that commend the Preachers, perhaps are diligent in hearing them: it may be, read all their books, and sing their hymns; and yet no change is wrought in their hearts.

Were they of old time as lions in their houses? They are the same still. Were they (in low life) slothful or intemperate? Were they tricking or dishonest? Over-reaching or oppressive? Or did they use to borrow and not pay? *The Ethiopian hath not changed his skin.* Were they (in high life) delicate, tender, self-indulgent? Were they nice in furniture or apparel? Were they fond of trifles, or of their own dear persons? *The Leopard hath not changed her spots.* Yet their being with us for a time proves no more, than that we have not the miraculous discernment of spirits.

Others you may find in whom there was a real change. But it was only for a season. They are now turned back, and are two-fold more the children of hell than before. Yet neither is this any manner of proof, that the former work was not of God. No, not though these apostates should, with the utmost confidence, say all manner of evil against us. I expect they should. For every other injury hath been forgiven, and will be to the end of the world. But hardly shall any one forgive the intolerable injury, of *almost persuading him to be a Christian.* When these men therefore who were with us, but went out from among us, assert things that may cause your ears to tingle, if you consider either the Scripture, or the nature of man, it will not stagger you at all. Much less will it excuse you, for not acknowledging the work in general to be of God.

28. But to all this it may possibly be replied, "When you bring your credentials with you, when you prove by miracles what you assert, then we will acknowledge that God hath sent you."

What is it you would have us prove by miracles? That the Doctrines we preach are true? This is not the way to prove that: (as our first Reformers replied to those of the Church of Rome, who, you may probably remember, were continually urging them with this very demand.) We prove the Doctrines we preach, by Scripture and Reason; and if need be, by Antiquity.

What else is it then we are to prove by Miracles? Is it,

1. That *A. B.* was for many years without God in the world, a common swearer, a drunkard, a sabbath-breaker? Or, 2. That he is not so now? Or, 3. That he continued so till he heard us preach, and from that time was another man?

Not so. The proper way to prove these facts, is by the testimony of competent witnesses: and these witnesses are ready, whenever required, to give full evidence of them.

Or would you have us prove by miracles, 4. That this was not done by our own power or holiness? That God only is able to raise the dead, those who are dead in trespasses and sins? Nay, if you hear not Moses, and the Prophets, and Apostles on this head, neither would you believe though one rose from the dead. It is therefore utterly unreasonable and absurd, to require or expect the proof of miracles, in questions of such a kind, as are always decided by proofs of quite a contrary nature.

29. "But you relate them yourself." I relate just what I saw, from time to time: and this is true, that some of those circumstances seem to go beyond the ordinary course of nature. But I do not peremptorily determine, whether they were supernatural, or not. Much less do I rest upon them, either the proof of other facts, or of those doctrines which I preach. I prove these in the ordinary way; the one by Testimony, the other by Scripture and Reason.

"But if you can work miracles when you please, is not this the surest way of proving them? This would put the matter out of dispute at once, and supersede all other proof."

You seem to lie under an entire mistake, both as to the nature and use of miracles. It may reasonably be questioned, whether there ever was that man living upon earth, except the man Christ Jesus, that could work miracles when he pleased. God only, when he pleased, exerted that power, and by whomsoever it pleased him. But if a man could work miracles when he pleased, yet is there no Scripture-authority, nor even example for doing it in order

to satisfy such a demand as this. I do not read, that either our Lord or any of his Apostles, wrought any miracle on such an occasion. Nay, how sharply does our Lord rebuke those who made a demand of this kind? When "certain of the Scribes and Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee;" (observe, this was their method of answering the strong reasons whereby he had just proved the works in question to be of God!) "He answered and said to them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign. But there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas," Matt. xii. 38, 39. "An evil and adulterous generation!" Else they would not have needed such a kind of proof. Had they been willing to do his will, they would, without this, have known that the doctrine was of God.

Miracles, therefore, are quite needless in such a case. Nor are they so conclusive a proof as you imagine. If a man could and did work them, in defence of any doctrine, yet this would not supersede other proof. For there may be τερατα Ψευδεα, lying Wonders, miracles wrought in support of falsehood. Still therefore this Doctrine would remain to be proved, from the proper topics of Scripture and Reason. And these even without Miracles are sufficient. But Miracles without these are not. Accordingly our Saviour and all his Apostles, in the midst of their greatest miracles, never failed to prove every Doctrine they taught, by clear Scripture and cogent Reason.

30. I presume, by this time you may perceive the gross absurdity, of demanding Miracles in the present case: seeing one of the propositions in question, (over and above our general Doctrines) viz. "That sinners are reformed," can only be proved by Testimony: and the other, "This cannot be done but by the power of God," needs no proof, being self-evident.

"Why, I did once myself rejoice to hear, (says a grave citizen, with an air of great importance) that so many sinners were reformed, till I found they were only turned from one wickedness to another; that they were turned

from cursing or swearing, or drunkenness, into the no less damnable sin of *Schism*." Do you know what you say? You have, I am afraid, a confused huddle of ideas in your head. And I doubt, you have not capacity to clear them up yourself; nor coolness enough to receive help from others. However, I will try. What is *Schism?* Have you any determinate idea of it? I ask the rather because I have found, by repeated experiments, that a common English tradesman receives no more light, when he hears or reads, "This is Schism," than if heard or read,

Bombalio, stridor, clangor, taratantara, murmur.

Honest neighbour do not be angry. Lay down your hammer, and let us talk a little on this head. You say, "We are in the damnable sin of Schism, and therefore in as bad a state as Adulterers and Murderers."

I ask once more, What do you mean by Schism? "Schism! Schism! Why, it is separating from the Church." Aye, so it is. And yet every separation from the Church to which we once belonged, is not Schism. Else you will make all the English to be Schismatics, in separating from the Church of Rome. "But we had just cause." So doubtless we had: whereas Schism is a causeless separation from the Church of Christ. So far so good. But you have many steps to take before you can make good that conclusion, that a separation from a particular National Church, such as the Church of England is, whether with sufficient cause or without, comes under the scriptural notion of Schism.

However, taking this for granted, will you aver in cool blood, That every one who dies a Quaker, a Baptist, an Independant, or a Presbyterian, is as infallibly damned as if he died in the act of murder or adultery? Surely you start at the thought! It makes even nature recoil. How then can you reconcile it to the Love that hopeth all things?

31. But whatever state they are in, who causelessly separate from the Church of England, it affects not those of whom we are speaking; for they do not separate from it at

all. You may easily be convinced of this, if you will only weigh the particulars following.

1. A great part of these went to no Church at all, before they heard us preach. They no more pretended to belong to the Church of England, than to the Church of Muscovy. If therefore they went to no Church now, they would be no farther from the Church than they were before.

2. Those who did sometimes go to Church before, go three times as often now. These therefore do not separate from the Church. Nay, they are united to it more closely than before.

3. Those who never went to Church at all before, do go now at all opportunities. Will common sense allow any one to say, that these are separated from the Church?

4. The main question is, Are they turned from doing the works of the devil, to do the works of God? Do they now live soberly, righteously, and godly, in the present world? If they do, if they live according to the Directions of the Church, believe her Doctrines, and join in her Ordinances: with what face can you say, that these men separate from the Church of England?

32. But in what state are they whom the Clergy and Gentry (and perhaps you for one) have successfully laboured to preserve from this damnable sin of Schism? Whom you have kept from hearing these men, and separating from the Church? Is not the drunkard that was, a drunkard still? Inquire of his poor wife and family. Is not the common swearer still horribly crying to God for damnation upon his own soul? Is not the sinner in every other kind, exactly the same man still? Not better at least, if he be not worse than he was ten years ago.

Now consider, 1. Does the Church of England gain either honour, or strength, or blessing, by such wretches as these calling themselves her Members? By ten thousand Drunkards, or Whoremongers, or Common Swearers? Nay, ought she not immediately to spew them out? To renounce all fellowship with them? Would she not be far better

without them than with them? Let any man of reason judge.

2. Is this Drunkard's calling himself of the Church of England, of any more use to him, than to the Church? Will this save him from hell, if he die in his sin? Will it not rather increase his damnation?

3. Is not a Drunkard of any other Church, just as good as a drunkard of the Church of England? Yea, is not a drunken Papist as much in the favour of God, as a drunken Protestant?

4. Is not a cursing, swearing Turk, (if there be such an one to be found) full as acceptable to God, as a cursing, swearing Christian?

Nay, 5. If there be any advantage, does it not lie on the side of the former? Is he not the less inexcusable of the two? As sinning against less light? O why will you sink these poor souls deeper into perdition, than they are sunk already? Why will you prophesy unto them, Peace, Peace; when there is no Peace? Why, if you do it not yourself (whether you cannot, or will not; God knoweth) should you hinder us from guiding them into the way of Peace?

33. Will you endeavour to excuse yourself by saying, "There are not many who are the better for your preaching: and these by and by will be as bad as ever; as such and such an one is already?"

I would to God I could set this in a just light! But I cannot. All language fails.

God begins a glorious work in our land. You set yourself against it with all your might: to prevent its beginning where it does not yet appear, and to destroy it wherever it does. In part you prevail. You keep many from hearing the word that is able to save their souls. Others who had heard it, you induce to turn back from God, and to list under the devil's banner again. Then you make the success of your own wickedness an excuse for not acknowledging the work of God! You urge "that not many sinners were

reformed! And that some of those are now as bad as ever!"

Whose fault is this? Is it ours? Or your own? Why have not thousands more been reformed? Yea, for every one who is now turned to God, why are there not ten thousand? Because you and your associates laboured so heartily in the cause of hell; because you and they spared no pains, either to prevent or to destroy the work of God! By using all the power and wisdom you had, you hindered thousands from hearing the Gospel, which they might have found to be the power of God unto salvation. Their blood is upon your heads. By inventing, or countenancing, or retailing lies, some refined, some gross and palpable, you hindered others from profiting by what they did hear. You are answerable to God for these souls also. Many who began to taste the good word, and run the way of God's commandments, you, by various methods, prevailed on to hear it no more. So they soon drew back to perdition. But know, that for every one of these also, God will require an account of you in the day of judgment.

34. And yet, in spite of all the malice, and wisdom, and strength, not only of men, but of "Principalities and Powers, of the Rulers of the Darkness of this World, of the wicked Spirits in high places;" there are thousands found, who are turned from "dumb idols, to serve the living and true God." What a harvest then might we have seen before now, if all who say, they are *on the Lord's side*, had come, as in all reason they ought, *to the help of the Lord against the mighty?* Yea, had they only not opposed the work of God, had they only refrained from his Messengers; might not the trumpet of God have been heard long since in every corner of our land? And thousands of sinners in every county been brought to *fear God and honour the King*.

Judge of what immense service we might have been, even in this single point, both to our King and Country. All who hear and regard the word we preach, "honour the King" for God's sake. They "render unto Cæsar the

things that are Cæsar's," as well as "unto God the things that are God's."—They have no conception of piety without loyalty; knowing "the powers that be, are ordained of God." I pray God to strengthen all that are of this mind, how many soever they be! But might there not have been at this day, a hundred thousand in England, thus minded more than are now? Yea, verily; even by our Ministry, had not they who should have strengthened us, weakened our hands.

35. Surely you are not wise! What advantages do you throw away? What opportunities do you lose? Such as another day you may earnestly seek, and nevertheless may not find them. For if it please God to remove us, whom will you find to supply our place? We are in all things your servants for Jesus' sake; though the more we love you, the less we are loved. Let us be employed not in the highest, but in the meanest; and not in the easiest, but in the hottest service. Ease and plenty we leave to those that want them. Let us go on in toil, in weariness, in painfulness, in cold or hunger, so we may but testify the Gospel of the grace of God. The rich, the honourable, the great, we are thoroughly willing (if it be the will of our Lord) to leave to you. Only let us alone with the poor, the vulgar, the base, the outcasts of men.—Take also to yourselves the Saints of the world; but suffer us to call sinners to repentance; even the most vile, the most ignorant, the most abandoned, the most fierce and savage of whom we can hear. To these we will go forth in the name of our Lord, desiring nothing, receiving nothing of any man (save the bread we eat, while we are under his roof) and let it be seen, whether God hath sent us. Only, let not your hands, who fear the Lord, be upon us. Why should we be stricken of you any more?

IV. 1. Surely ye are without excuse, all who do not yet know the day of your visitation? The day, wherein the great God, who hath been forgotten among us, days without number, is arising at once to be avenged of his adversaries, and to visit and redeem his people. And are not his

judgments and mercies both abroad? And still, will ye not learn righteousness? Is not the Lord passing by? Doth not a great and strong wind already begin to rend the mountains, and to break in pieces the rocks before the Lord? Is not the earthquake also felt already? And a fire hath begun to burn in his anger. Who knoweth what will be the end thereof? But at the same time, he is speaking to man in a still, small voice. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear, lest he be suddenly destroyed, and that without remedy!

2. What excuse can possibly be made for those, who are regardless of such a season as this? Who are at such a crisis, stupid, senseless, unapprehensive; caring for none of these things? Who do not give themselves the pains to think about them, but are still easy and unconcerned? What! can there ever be a point, on which it more behoves you to think? And that with the coolest and deepest attention? As long as the heaven and the earth remain, can there be any thing of so vast importance, as God's Last Call to a guilty land, just perishing in its iniquity?

You, with those round about you, deserved long ago to have "drank the dregs of the cup of trembling:" yea, to have been "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." But he hath not dealt with you according to your sins, neither rewarded you after your iniquities. And once more he is mixing mercy with judgment. Once more he is crying aloud, "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O House of Israel;" and will you not deign to give him the hearing; if you are not careful to answer him in this matter? Do you still shut your eyes, and stop your ears, and harden your stubborn heart?—Oh, beware, lest God laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh!

3. Will you plead that you have other concerns to mind? That other business engages your thoughts? It does so indeed; but this is your foolishness; this is the very thing that leaves you without excuse.—For what busi-

ness can be of equal moment? The mariner may have many concerns to mind, and many businesses to engage his thoughts: but not when the ship is sinking. In such a circumstance (it is your own!) you have but one thing to think of. Save the ship and your own life together! And the higher post you are in, the more deeply intent should you be on this one point. Is this a time for diversions? For eating and drinking, and rising up to play? Keep the ship above water. Let all else go, and mind *This one thing!*

4. Perhaps you will say, "So I do. I do mind this one thing, how to save the sinking nation. And therefore now I must think of Arms and Provisions. I have no time now to think of Religion." This is exactly as if the mariner should say, "Now I must think of my Guns and Stores. I have no time now to think of the Hold." Why man, you must think of this, or perish. It is there the Leak is sprung. Stop that, or you and all your Stores will go together to the bottom of the sea.

Is not this your case? Then, whatever you do, stop the Leak: else you go to the bottom! I do not speak against your Stores. They are good in their kind; and it may be well they are laid in.—But all your Stores will not save the sinking ship, unless you can stop the Leak. Unless you can some way keep out these floods of ungodliness, that are still continually pouring in, you must soon be swallowed up in the great deep, in the Abyss of God's judgments. This, this is the destruction of the English nation. It is vice bursting in on every side, that is just ready to sink us into slavery first, and then into the nethermost hell.—"Who is a wise man, and endued with knowledge among you?" Let him think of this. Think of this, all that love your country, or care for your own souls. If now especially you do not think of this one thing, you have no excuse before God or man.

5. Little more excuse have you, who are still in doubt concerning this day of your visitation. For you have all the proof that you can reasonably expect or desire, all that

the nature of the thing requires. That in many places, abundance of notorious sinners are totally reformed, is declared by a thousand eye and ear-witnesses, both of their present and past behaviour. And you are sensible, the proof of such a point as this must, in the nature of things, rest upon testimony. And that God alone is able to work such a reformation, you know all the Scriptures testify. What would you have more? What pretence can you have, for doubting any longer? You have not the least room to expect or desire any other, or any stronger evidence.

I trust, you are not of those who fortify themselves against conviction; who are "resolved they will never believe this." They ask, "Who are these men?" We tell them plainly; but they credit us not. Another and another of their own friends is convinced, and tells them the same thing. But their answer is ready, "Are you turned Methodist too?" So their testimony likewise goes for nothing. Now how is it possible these should ever be convinced? For they will believe none but those who speak on one side.

6. Do you delay fixing your judgment, till you see a work of God, without any stumbling-block attending it? That never was yet, nor ever will. *It must needs be, that offences should come.* And scarce ever was there such a work of God before, with so few as have attended this.

When the Reformation began, what mountainous offences lay in the way, of even the sincere Members of the Church of Rome! They saw such failings in those great men, Luther and Calvin! Their vehement tenaciousness of their own opinion: their bitterness towards all who differed from them; their impatience of contradiction, and utter want of forbearance, even with their own brethren.

But the grand stumbling-block of all, was, their open, avowed separation from the Church; their rejecting so many of the doctrines and practices, which the others accounted the most sacred; and their continual invectives

against the Church they separated from, so much sharper than Michael's reproof of Satan.

Were there fewer stumbling-blocks attending the Reformation in England? Surely not; for what was Henry the Eighth? Consider either his character, his motives to the work, or his manner of pursuing it! And even King Edward's Ministry we cannot clear of persecuting in their turns, yea, and burning Heretics. The main stumbling-block also still remained, viz. open separation from the Church.

7. Full as many were the offences that lay in the way of even the sincere Members of the Church of England, when the people called Quakers first professed that they were sent of God to reform the land. Whether they were or not, is beside our question: it suffices for the present purpose to observe, that over and above their open, avowed, total separation from the Church, and their vehement invectives against many of her doctrines, and the whole frame of her Discipline; they spent their main strength in disputing about Opinions and Externals, rather than in preaching faith, mercy, and the love of God.

In these respects, the case was nearly the same when the Baptists first appeared in England. They immediately commenced a warm dispute, not concerning the vitals of Christianity, but concerning the manner and time of administering one of the external Ordinances of it. And as their Opinion hereof totally differed from that of all the other Members of the Church of England, so they soon openly declared their separation from it, not without sharp censures of those that continued therein.

8. The same occasion of offence was, in a smaller degree, given by the Presbyterians and Independents: for they also spent great part of their time and strength, in opposing the commonly received Opinions concerning some of the circumstantials of Religion; and for the sake of these, separated from the Church.

But I do not include that venerable man, Mr. Philip

Henry, nor any that were of his spirit in this number. I know they abhorred contending about Externals. Neither did they separate themselves from the Church. They continued therein, till they were driven out, whether they would or not. I cannot but tenderly sympathise with these; and the more, because this is, in part, our own case. Warm men, spare no pains, at this very day to drive us out of the Church. They cry out to the people, wherever one of us comes, "A Mad Dog! a Mad Dog!" if haply we might flee for our lives, as many have done before us. And sure it is, we should have complied with their desire, we should merely for peace and quietness have left the Church long before now, but that we could not in conscience do it. And it is on this single motive, it is for conscience' sake that we still continue therein; and shall continue (God being our helper) unless they by violence thrust us out.

9. But to return. What are the stumbling-blocks in the present case, compared to those in any of the preceding?

We do not dispute concerning any of the externals or circumstantials of Religion. There is no room; for we agree with you therein. We approve of, and adhere to them all: all that we learned together when we were children, in our Catechism and Common-Prayer Book. We were born and bred up in your own Church, and desire to die therein. We always were, and are now, zealous for the Church; only not with a blind, angry zeal. We hold, and ever have done, the same opinions, which you and we received from our forefathers. But we do not lay the main stress of our Religion on any Opinions, right or wrong: neither do we ever begin, or willingly join in any dispute concerning them. The weight of all Religion, we apprehend, rests on Holiness of Heart and Life. And consequently, wherever we come, we press this with all our might. How wide then is the difference between our case and the case of any of those that are above-mentioned? They avowedly separated from the Church: we utterly disavow any such design. They severely, and almost conti-

nually, inveighed against the Doctrines and Discipline of the Church they left. We approve both the Doctrines and Discipline of our Church, and inveigh only against Ungodliness and Unrighteousness. They spent great part of their time and strength in contending about Externals and Circumstantials. We agree with you in both; so that having no room to spend any time in such vain Contention, we have our desire of spending and being spent, in promoting plain practical Religion. How many stumbling-blocks are removed out of your way! Why do not you acknowledge the work of God?

10. If you say, "Because you hold Opinions which I cannot believe are true:" I answer, believe them true or false; I will not quarrel with you about any Opinion. Only see that your heart be right towards God, that you know and love the Lord Jesus Christ: that you love your Neighbour, and walk as your Master walked, and I desire no more. I am sick of Opinions: I am weary to bear them. My soul loathes this frothy food. Give me solid and substantial Religion. Give me an humble, gentle Lover of God and Man; a Man full of Mercy and good Fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy: a man laying himself out in the Work of Faith, the Patience of Hope, the Labour of Love. Let my soul be with these Christians, wheresoever they are, and whatsoever Opinion they are of. "Whosoever" thus "doth the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my Brother, and Sister, and Mother."

11. Inexcusably infatuated must you be, if you can even doubt whether the propagation of this Religion be of God! Only more inexcusable are those unhappy men, who oppose, contradict, and blaspheme it.

How long will you stop your ears against him, that still crieth, "Why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks;" for a man to "contend with his Maker." How long will you despise the well-known advice of a great and learned man, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone. If this work be of man, it will come to nought. But if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it." And

why should you "be found even to fight against God?" If a man fight with God, shall he prevail? "Canst thou thunder with a voice like him?" Make haste! Fall down! Humble thyself before him! Lest he put forth his hand, and thou perish.

12. How long will you fight under the banner of the great Enemy of God and man? You are now in his service: you are taking part with the devil against God. Even supposing there were no other proof, this would undeniably appear, from the goodly company among whom you are enlisted, and who war one and the same warfare. I have heard some affirm, that the most bitter enemies to the present work of God, were Pharisees. They meant, men who had the form of godliness, but denied the power of it. But I cannot say so. The sharpest adversaries thereof whom I have hitherto known, (unless one might except a few honourable men, whom I may be excused from naming,) were the Scum of Cornwall, the Rabble of Bilston and Darlaston; the wild Beasts of Walsal, and the Turnkeys of Newgate.

13. Might not the very sight of these troops, shew any reasonable men, to what General they belonged? As well as the weapons they never fail to use; the most horrid oaths and execrations, and lawless violence, carrying away as a flood whatsoever it is which stands before it: having no eyes, nor ears, no regard to the loudest cries of reason, justice, or humanity: can you join heart or hands with these any longer? With such an infamous, scandalous rabble-rout, roaring and raging, as if they were just broke loose, with their Captain Apollyon, from the bottomless pit? Does it not rather concern you, and that in the highest degree, as well as every friend to his King and Country, every lover of peace, justice, and mercy, immediately to join and stop any such godless crews, as they would join to stop a fire just beginning to spread, or an inundation of the sea?

14. If, on the contrary, you join with that godless crew, and strengthen their hands in their wickedness, must not

you, in all reason, be accounted (like them) a public enemy of mankind? And indeed such must every one appear, in the eye of unprejudiced reason, who opposes directly or indirectly, the reformation of mankind. By Reformation I mean, the bringing them back (not to this or that system of opinions, or to this or that set of rites and ceremonies, how decent and significant soever; but) to the calm love of God and one another, to a uniform practice of justice, mercy, and truth. With what colour can you lay any claim to humanity, to benevolence, to public spirit, if you can once open your mouth, or stir one finger, against such a reformation as this?

It is a poor excuse to say, "O, but the people are brought into several erroneous opinions." It matters not a straw, whether they are or not: (I speak of such opinions as do not touch the foundation) it is scarcely worth while to spend ten words about it. Whether they embrace this religious opinion or that, is no more concern to me, than whether they embrace this or that system of astronomy. Are they brought to holy tempers and holy lives? This is mine, and should be your inquiry; since on this, both social and personal happiness depend: happiness, temporal and eternal. Are they brought to the love of God and the love of their neighbour? Pure religion and undefiled is this, how long then will you darken counsel, by words without knowledge? The plain religion now propagated is LOVE. And can you oppose this, without being an enemy to mankind?

15. No; nor without being an enemy to your King and Country: especially at such a time as this. For however men of no thought may not see or regard it, or hectoring cowards may brave it out, it is evident to every man of calm reflection, that our nation stands on the very brink of destruction. And why are we thus, but because the cry of our wickedness is gone up to heaven, because we have so exceedingly, abundantly beyond measure, corrupted our ways before the Lord. And because, to all our other abominations we have added, the open fighting against God; the not only rejecting, but even denying, yea, blaspheming

his last offers of mercy; the hindering others who were desirous to close therewith: the despitefully using his messengers, and the variously troubling and oppressing those who did accept of his grace, break off their sins, and turn to him with their whole heart.

16. I cannot but believe, it is chiefly on this account, that God hath now "a controversy with our land." And must not any considerate man be inclined to form the same judgment, if he reviews the state of public affairs, for only a few years last past? I will not enter into particulars. But, in general, can you possibly help observing, that whenever there has been any thing like a public attempt, to suppress *this new Sect*, (for so it was artfully represented,) another and another public trouble arose. This has been repeated so often, that it is surprising any man of sense can avoid taking notice of it. May we turn at length "to him that smiteth us, hear the rod, and him that appointeth it!" May we "humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God," before the great deep swallow us up!

17. Just now, viz. on the 4th of this instant December, the Reverend Mr. Henry Wickham, one of his Majesty's Justices of Peace for the West-Riding of Yorkshire, writes an order,

To the Constable of Keighley, commanding him, "to convey the body of Jonathan Reeves, (whose real crime is, the calling sinners to repentance,) to his Majesty's Gaol and Castle of York; suspected (saith the precept) of being a Spy among us, and a dangerous man to the person and government of his Majesty King George."

God avert the omen! I fear this is no presage either of the repentance or deliverance of our poor nation!

18. If we will not turn and repent, if we will harden our hearts, and acknowledge neither his judgments nor mercies; what remains but the fulfilling of that dreadful word, which God spake by the Prophet Ezekiel; "Son of man, when the land sinneth against me, by trespassing grievously; then will I stretch forth my hand upon it, and break the staff of the bread thereof.—Though these three men,

Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls. Or if I bring a sword upon that land, and say, 'Sword, go through the land:'—Or if I send a pestilence into that land, and pour out my fury upon it in blood:—Though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall but deliver their own souls by their righteousness," ch. xiv. ver. 13, 14, 17, 19, 20.

"Yet behold, therein shall be left a remnant, that shall be brought forth, both sons and daughters.—And ye shall be comforted concerning the evil that I have brought upon Jerusalem.—And ye shall know that I have not done without cause, all that I have done in it, saith the Lord God," ver. 22, 23.

London, Dec. 18, 1745.

AN

ANSWER

TO THE

Rev. Mr. Church's "Remarks on the Rev. Mr. John Wesley's last Journal:"

IN A LETTER TO THAT GENTLEMAN.

"Let not him that putteth on his harness, boast himself as he that putteth it off," 1 Kings xx. 11.

REVEREND SIR,

1. MY first desire (and prayer to God) is, That I may live peaceably with all men. My next, That if I must dispute at all, it may be with a man of understanding. Thus far, therefore, I rejoice on the present occasion. I rejoice also in that I have confidence of your sincerity, of your real desire, to promote the glory of God, by peace and good-will among men. I am likewise thankful to God, for your calm manner of writing; (a few paragraphs excepted:) and yet more for this, That *such* an opponent should, by writing in *such* a manner, give me an opportunity of explaining myself on those very heads, whereon I wanted an occasion so to do.

2. I do not want indeed (though perhaps you think I do) to widen the breach between us, or to represent the difference of the doctrines we severally teach, as greater than it really is. So far from it, that I earnestly wish, there were

none at all; or if there must be some, that it may be as small as possible: being fully persuaded, that could we once agree in doctrines, other differences would soon fall to the ground.

3. In order to contribute, as I am able, to this, it will be my endeavour, to acknowledge what I think you have spoken right, and to answer what I cannot think right as yet, with what brevity and clearness I can. I desire to do this, in as inoffensive a manner, as the nature of the thing will bear; and consistently with that brotherly love, which I cannot deny you, without wronging my own soul.

4. You sum up your charge thus: "You have now, Sir, my sentiments—It is impossible for you to put an entire stop, to the enormities of the Moravians, while you still, I. Too much commend these men; II. Hold principles in common with them, from which these enormities naturally follow; and, III. Maintain other errors more than theirs, and are guilty of enthusiasm to the highest degree."*

I. 1. You, first, charge me with *too much commending the* Moravians. That the case may be fully understood, I will transcribe the passages which you cite from the Journal concerning them, and then give a general answer.

'She told me, Mr. Molther had advised her, till she received faith, to be *still, ceasing from outward works*.—In the evening, Mr. Bray was also commending the being *still*:—He likewise spoke largely, of the *great danger* that attended the doing of *outward works*, and of the folly of people that keep *running about to church and sacrament*.'†

'Sund. Nov. 4. Our society met, and continued *silent* till eight.'‡ 'Sund. June 22. I spoke thus: Eight or nine months ago, certain men arose, who affirmed, that there is no such thing as any *means of grace*;—and that we ought to leave off these *works of the law*.'§ 'You (Mr. Molther)

* Remarks, p. 73, 74. † 4th Journal, Vol. II. p. 5.
‡ Vol. II. p. 5. § Vol. II. p. 37.

N. B. The Sentences quoted from the REMARKS, are all distinguished with inverted commas.

believe, that the way to attain faith, is, not to go to church, not to communicate, not to fast, not to use *so much* private prayer, not to read the Scripture; not to do temporal good, or attempt to do spiritual good.'* 'You undervalue *good works*, especially works of *outward mercy*, never publickly insisting on the necessity of them.'†

'Some of our brethren asserted, 1. That till they had true faith, they ought to be *still*, that is, (as they explained themselves,) to abstain from the *means of grace*, as they are called, the Lord's Supper in particular. 2. That the ordinances are not *means of grace*, there being no other means than Christ.'‡ 'I could not agree, either that none has any faith, so long as he is liable to any doubt or fear, or that till we have it, we ought to abstain from the ordinances of God.'§

'Mr. Br——d speaks so slightly of the *means of grace*, that many are much grieved to hear him. But others are greatly delighted with him. Ten or fourteen of them meet at our brother Clark's, with Mr. Molther, and make a mere jest of going to church or to the sacrament.'‖

'You (Mr. Molther) believe, it is imposible for a man to *use these means*, without *trusting in them*.'¶

'Believers (said Mr. Simpson) are *not subject* to ordinances, and unbelievers have nothing to do with them.'** 'Believers *need not*, and unbelievers *may not* use them. These *do not* sin when they *abstain* from them; but those *do sin*, when they do not abstain.'††

'For one who is not born of God, to read the Scriptures, or to pray, or to communicate, or to do any outward work, is *deadly poison*.—If he does any of these things, he *destroys* himself.'‡‡ 'Mr. Bell earnestly defended this.'

'At eight the society (at Nottingham) met; I could not but observe—that not one who came in, used any prayer at all.—I looked for one of our hymn-books, but both that and

* Vol. II. p. 17. † p. 102. ‡ p. 5. § p. 6. ‖ p. 15.
¶ p. 17. ** p. 30. †† p. 39. ‡‡ p. 44.

Bible were vanished away, and in the room thereof lay, the Moravian hymns and the Count's Sermons.'*

'One of our English brethren, joined with you, said in his public expounding, As many go to hell by *praying*, as by *thieving*. Another, I knew one, who, leaning over the back of a chair, received a great gift. But he must kneel down, to give God thanks. So he lost it immediately. And I know not whether he will ever have it again. And yet another, You have lost your first joy. Therefore you pray. That is the devil. You read the Bible. That is the devil. You communicate. That is the devil' †

'They affirmed, that there is *no commandment* in the New Testament, but to *believe*; that no other *duty* lies upon us; and, that when a man does believe, he is not *bound* or *obliged*, to do any thing which is commanded there.'‡ 'Mr. St—— told me, No one has *any degree* of faith, till he is perfect as God is perfect.'§ 'You believe there are *no degrees* in faith.'‖ 'I have heard Mr. Molther affirm, that there is no justifying faith, where there is ever any doubt.'¶ 'The moment a man is justified, he is sanctified wholly. Thenceforth, till death, he is neither more nor less holy.'** 'We are to grow in grace, but not in holiness.'††

2. I have frequently observed, that I wholly disapprove of all these positions, 'That there are *no degrees* in faith;' 'That in order to attain faith, we must *abstain* from all the *ordinances* of God;' 'That a believer does not *grow in holiness*,' and 'That he is not *obliged* to keep the commandments of God.' But I must also observe, 1. That you ought not to charge the Moravian church with the first of these; since in the very page from which you quote those words, 'There is no justifying faith where there is ever any doubt' that note occurs, 'In the preface to the second Journal, the Moravian church is cleared from this mistake.' 2. That with respect to the ordinances of God,

Vol. II. * p. 82. † p. 100. ‡ p. 37. § p. 31.
‖ p. 31. ¶ p. 98. ** p. 93. †† p. 94.

their practice is better than their principle. They do use them themselves, I am a witness; and that with reverence and godly fear. Those expressions, however, of our own countrymen, are utterly indefensible; as, I think, are Mr. Molther's also; who was quickly after recalled into Germany. The great fault of the Moravian church seems to lie in not openly disclaiming all he had said: which in all probability they would have done, had they not leaned to the same opinion. I must, 3. Observe, that I never knew one of the Moravian church, but that single person affirm, 'That a believer does not grow in holiness.' And perhaps he would not affirm it, on reflection. But I am still afraid their whole church is tainted with Quietism, Universal Salvation, and Antinomianism: 'I speak (as I said elsewhere) of *Antinomian opinions*, abstracted from practice, good or bad.'

3. But I should rejoice if there lay no other objection against them, than that of erroneous opinions. I know in some measure, how to have compassion on the ignorant: I know the incredible force of pre-possession. And God only knows, what ignorance or error (all things considered) is invincible; and what allowance his mercy will make in such cases, to those who desire to be led into all truth. But how far what follows may be imputed to invincible ignorance or pre-possession, I cannot tell.

Many of * 'you greatly, yea above measure, exalt yourselves (as a church) and despise others: I have scarcely heard one Moravian brother own *his church* to be wrong in any thing:' 'Many of you I have heard speak of it, as if it were infallible:' 'Some of you have set it up, as the judge of all the earth, of all persons as well as doctrines:' 'Some of you have said, that there is no *true church* but yours; yea, that there are no *true Christians* out of it:' 'And your own members you require to have *implicit faith* in her decisions, and to pay *implicit* obedience to her directions.'

* Vol. II, p. 100, 101.

I can in no degree justify these things. And yet neither can I look upon them in the same light that you do, as * "some of the very worst things which are objected to the Church of Rome." They are exceedingly great mistakes; yet in as great mistakes have holy men both lived and died: Thomas à Kempis, for instance, and Francis Sales. And yet I doubt not, they are now in Abraham's bosom.

4. I am more concerned for their † 'Despising and decrying self-denial:' for their ‡ 'extending Christian liberty beyond all warrant of Holy Writ;' for their ‡ 'Want of zeal for good works; and above all for their supposing, that ‖ 'we may, on some accounts, use guile:' in consequence of which they do ¶ 'use guile or dissimulation in many cases.' ** 'Nay, in many of them I have found (not in all, nor in most) much subtlety, much evasion and disguise; so *becoming all things to all men*, as to take the colour and shape of any that were near them.' I can neither defend nor excuse those among the Moravians, whom I have found guilty of this. But neither can I condemn *all* for the sake of *some*. *Every man shall give an account of himself to God.*

But you say, †† "Your protesting against some of their opinions, is not sufficient to discharge you—Have you not prepared the way for these Moravians, by—countenancing and commending them: and by still speaking of them as if they were in the main the best Christians in the world, and only deluded or mistaken in a few points?"

I cannot speak of them otherwise than I think. And I still think, 1. That God has some thousands in our own church, who have the faith and love which is among them, without those errors either of judgment or practice; 2. That next to these, *the body* of the *Moravian* church, however *mistaken some of them* are, are *in the main*, of all whom I have seen, the *best Christians* in the world.

5. Because I am continually charged with inconsistency

* Remarks, p. 7. † Vol. II. p. 75. ‡ p. 75. ‖ p. 18.
¶ p. 104. ** p. 98. †† Remarks, p. 11, 12.

herein, even by the Moravians themselves, it may be 'needful to give a short account of what has occurred between us from the beginning.' * 'My first acquaintance with the Moravian brethren began in my voyage to Georgia. Being then with many of them in the same ship, I narrowly observed their whole behaviour. And I greatly approved of all I saw.' (The particulars are related in the first Journal.)

'From Feb. 14, 1735, to Dec. 2, 1737, being with them, (except when I went to Frederica or Carolina,) twice or thrice every day, I loved and esteemed them more and more. *Yet a few things I could not approve of.* These I mentioned to them from time to time, and then commended the cause to God.

'In February following I met with Peter Bohler. My heart clave to him as soon as he spoke. And the more we conversed, so much the more did I esteem, both him and the Moravian church. So that I had no rest in my spirit, till I executed the design which I had formed long before; till after a short stay in Holland, I hastened forward, first to Marienbourn, and then to Hernhuth.'

It may be observed, that I had before seen *a few things* in the Moravians *which I could not approve of.* In this journey I saw *a few more*, in the midst of many excellent things: in consequence whereof,

'In Sept. 1738, soon after my return to England, I began the following letter to the Moravian church. But being fearful of trusting my own judgment, I determined to wait yet a little longer, and so laid it by unfinished.'

'My Dear Brethren,

'I Cannot but rejoice in your steadfast faith, in your love to our blessed Redeemer, your deadness to the world, your meekness, temperance, and chastity, and love of one another. I greatly approve of your conferences and † bands,

* These are the words of the 4th Journal, Vol. II. p. 103, &c.

† The Band Society in London, began May 1, some time before I set out for Germany.

of your methods of instructing children; and in general, of your great care of the souls committed to your charge.

'But of some other things I stand in doubt, which I will mention in love and meekness. And I wish that, in order to remove those doubts, you would, on each of those heads, first, plainly answer, whether the fact be as I suppose; and if so, secondly, consider, whether it be right? Is not the Count all in all among you? Do you not magnify your own church too much? Do you not use guile and dissimulation in many cases? Are you not of a close, dark, reserved temper and behaviour?'——

It may easily be seen, that my objections then were nearly the same as now. (Only with this difference; I was not then assured, that the facts were as I supposed. Yet I cannot say my affection was lessened at all, for I did not dare to determine any thing.) But from Nov. 1, I could not but see more and more, things which I could not reconcile with the gospel.

These I have set down with all simplicity:—Yet do I this, because I love them not? God knoweth: yea, and *in part*, I esteem them still: because I verily believe, they have a sincere desire to serve God; because many of them have tasted of his love, and some retain it in simplicity; because they love one another; because they have *so much* of the truth of the gospel, and *so far* abstain from outward sin. And, lastly, because their discipline is, *in most respects*, so truly excellent: (notwithstanding that visible blemish, the paying *too much* regard, to their great patron and benefactor, Count Zinzendorf.)

6. I believe, if you coolly consider this account, you will not find, either that it is inconsistent with itself; or that it lays you under any necessity of speaking in the following manner: * "What charms there may be in a demure look and a sour behaviour, I know not. But sure they must be in your eye very extraordinary, as they can be sufficient to cover such a multitude of errors and crimes, and keep up

* Remarks, p. 18, 19.

the same regard and affection for the authors and abettors of them. I doubt your regard for them was not lessened, till they began to interfere with what you thought your province.—You were influenced, not by a just resentment to see the honour of religion and virtue so injuriously and scandalously trampled upon, but by a fear of losing your own authority."

I doubt, there is scarcely one line of all these, which is consistent either with truth or love. But I will transcribe a few more, before I answer. "How could you so long and so intimately converse with, so much commend, and give such countenance to such desperately wicked people, as the Moravians, according to your own account, were known by you to be?—And you still speak of them, as if they were in the main, the best Christians in the world.—In one place you say, 'A few things I could not approve of.' But in God's name, Sir, is the contempt of almost the whole of our duty, of every Christian ordinance, to be so gently touched? Can detestation, in such a case, be too strongly expressed? Either they are some of the vilest wretches in the world, or you are the falsest accuser in the world. Christian charity has scarcely an allowance to make for them as you have described them. If you have done this truly, they ought to be discouraged, by all means that can be imagined."

7. Let us now weigh these assertions! "They (i. e. the charms of their sour behaviour) must be in your eye very extraordinary."—Do not you stumble at the threshold? The Moravians excel in *sweetness* of behaviour—"as they can be sufficient to cover such a multitude of errors and crimes"—Such a *multitude* of *errors* and *crimes!* I believe, as to errors, they hold *universal salvation*, and are partly Antinomians, (in opinion) and partly Quietists. And for this cause I cannot join with them. But where is the *multitude* of errors? Whosoever knows two or three hundred more, let him please to mention them.

Such a *multitude* of *crimes* too! That some of them have used guile, and are of a close and reserved behaviour, I know. And I excuse them not. But to this multitude of

crimes I am an utter stranger. Let *him* prove this charge upon them who *can*. For *me*, I declare, I *cannot*.

"To keep up the same regard and affection."—Not so. My affection was *not lessened, till* after September, 1739, till I had proof of what I had *feared* before. But I had not the same degree of regard for them, when I saw the dark as well as the bright side of their character. "I doubt your regard for them was not lessened, till they began to interfere with what you thought your province." If this were only a *doubt*, it were not much amiss; but it presently shoots up into an *assertion*; equally groundless: for my *regard* for them *lessened*, even while I was in Georgia. But it increased again, after my return from thence, especially while I was at Hernhuth. And it gradually *lessened* again for some years, as I saw more and more which I approved not. How then does it appear, that I was influenced herein, "by a fear of losing my own authority? Not by a just resentment to see the honour of religion and virtue so scandalously trampled upon."—*Trampled upon!* By whom? Not by the Moravians: I never saw any such thing among them.

But what do you mean by a just resentment? I hope you do not mean, what is *commonly* called *zeal:* a flame which often 'sets on fire the whole course of nature, and is itself set on fire of hell.'—'Rivers of water run from my eyes, because men keep not thy law.' This resentment, on such an occasion, I understand. From all other, may God deliver me!

8. You go on. "How could you so long and so intimately converse with—such desperately wicked people, as the Moravians, according to your own account, were known by you to be?" O Sir, what another assertion is this! "The Moravians, according to your own account, were known by you to be desperately wicked people, while you intimately conversed with them!" Utterly false and injurious. I never gave any such account. I conversed intimately with them, both at Savannah and Hernhuth. But neither then, nor at any other time, did I *know*, or think, or say, they were despe-

rately wicked people. I think and say, nay, you blame me for saying, just the reverse, viz. That though I soon "found among them a few things which I could not approve," yet I believe they are "in the main some of the best Christians in the world."

You surprise me yet more in going on thus: "In God's name, Sir, is the contempt of almost the whole of our duty, of every Christian ordinance, to be so very gently touched?" Sir, this is not the case. This charge no more belongs to the Moravians, than that of murder. Some of our countrymen spoke very wicked things. The Moravians did not sufficiently disavow them. These are the premises. By what art can you extort so dreadful a conclusion from them?

"Can detestation in such a case, be too strongly expressed?"—Indeed it can; even were the case as you suppose.—"Either they are some of the vilest wretches in the world, or you are the falsest accuser in the world;"—neither one, nor the other; though I prove what I allege, yet they may be, in the main, good men;—"Charity has scarcely an allowance to make for them, as you have described them:"—I have described them, as of a mixed character, with much evil among them, but more good. Is it not a strange kind of charity, which cannot find an allowance, to make in such a case?—"If you have described them truly, they ought to be discouraged by all means that can be imagined;"—By all means! I hope not by fire and faggot: though the *House of Mercy* imagines these to be of all means most effectual.

9. You proceed. * "How can you justify the many good things you say of the Moravians, notwithstanding this character? You say they love God. But how can this be, when they even plead against keeping most of his commandments? You say, you believe, they have a sincere desire to serve God. How then can they despise his service in so many instances? You declare some of them

* Remarks, p. 20, 21.

much holier than any people you had yet known. Strange! if they fail in so many prime points of Christian duty, and this not only habitually and presumptuously, but even to the denying their use and necessity. You praise them, for trampling under foot the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life. And yet you make them a close, reserved, insincere, deceitful people.

"How you will explain those things, I know not." By nakedly declaring each thing as it is. They are, I believe, the most self-inconsistent people, now under the sun: and I describe them just as I find them, neither better nor worse, but leaving the good and bad together. Upon this ground I can very easily justify, the saying *many good things* of them, as well as bad. For instance, I am still persuaded, that *they* (many of them) *love* God: although many others of them ignorantly "plead against the keeping" not *most*, but *some* "of his commandments." I believe, "they have a sincere desire to serve God." And yet, in several instances, some of them (I think) *despise* that manner *of serving him*, which I know God hath ordained. I believe "some of them are much holier than any people I had known in August, 1740." Yet sure I am, that others among them *fail*, not indeed in the "prime points of Christian duty," (for these are faith and the love of God and man) but in several points of no small importance. Not that they herein sin *presumptuously* neither; for they are "fully (though erroneously) persuaded in their own minds." From the same persuasion they act, when they (in some sense) "deny the use or necessity of those ordinances." How far that persuasion will justify or excuse them, I leave to him who knoweth their hearts. Lastly, I believe "they trample under foot," in a good degree, "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life." And yet many of them *use reserve, yea, guile*. Therefore my soul mourns for them in secret places.

10. "But I must observe," you say, "that * you fall

* Remarks, p. 21, 22.

not only into inconsistencies, but into direct contradictions. You commend them for 'loving one another in a manner the world knoweth not of.' And yet you charge them with being 'in the utmost confusion, biting and devouring one another.' You say, 'They caution us against natural love of one another:—And had well nigh destroyed brotherly love from among us.'

"You praise them, for 'using no diversions but such as become saints,' and for 'not regarding outward adorning.' Yet you say, they 'conform to the world in wearing gold and costly apparel: and by joining in worldly diversions to do good.'

"You call their discipline, 'in most respects, truly excellent.' I wish you had more fully explained yourself. I am sure it is no sign of good discipline, to permit such abominations. And you tell them yourself, 'I can shew you such a subordination, as answers all Christian purposes, and yet is as distant from that among you, as the heavens are from the earth.'

"You mention it as a good effect of their discipline, that 'every one knows and keeps his proper rank.' Soon after, as if it were a design to confute yourself, you say, 'Our brethren have neither wisdom enough to guide, nor prudence enough to let it alone.'

"And now, Sir, how can you reconcile these opposite descriptions?" Just as easily as those before, by simply declaring the thing as it is. "You * commend them (the Moravians) for loving one another. And yet charge them with biting † and devouring one another." Them! whom? Not the Moravians; but the English brethren of Fetter-lane, before their union with the Moravians. Here then is no shadow of contradiction. For the two sentences do not relate to the same persons.

"You say, † 'They had well nigh destroyed brotherly love from among us;' partly by 'cautions ‡ against natural love.' It is a melancholy truth; so they had. But *we*

* Vol. II. p. 3. † p. 15. ‡ p. 101.

had then no connexion with *them*. Neither therefore, does this contradict 'their *loving one another*, in a manner the world knoweth not of.'

"You praise them for * using no diversions but such as become saints: and yet say, (I recite the whole sentence) † 'I have heard some of you affirm, that Christian salvation implies to conform to the world, by joining in worldly diversions, in order to do good.' And both these are true. The Moravians, in general, 'use no diversions but such as become saints:' and yet I have heard some of them affirm (in contradiction to their own practice) that 'One then mentioned did well, when he joined in *playing at tennis*, in order to do good.'

11. "You praise them for not ‡ 'regarding outward adorning.'" So I do, the bulk of the congregation. "And yet you say, (I again recite the whole sentence,) 'I § have heard some of you affirm, that Christian salvation implies liberty to conform to the world, by putting on of gold and costly apparel.'" I have so. And I blame them the more, because they are condemned by the general practice of their own church.

"You call their discipline, 'in most respects truly excellent.' ‖ I could wish you had more fully explained yourself."—I have in the second Journal, from the 44th to the 82d page. "It is no sign of good discipline, to permit such abominations," (i.e. error, in opinion; and guile, in practice:) true, it is not; nor is it any demonstration against it. For there may be *good discipline* even in a college of Jesuits. Another fault is, too great a deference to the Count. And yet, 'in *most respects*, their discipline is truly excellent.'

"You mention it as a good effect of their discipline, that ¶ 'every one knows and keeps his proper rank.' Soon after, as if it were with a design to confute yourself, you say, 'Our brethren have neither wisdom enough to guide, nor prudence enough to let it alone.'"** Pardon me, Sir, I have

* Vol. II. p. 3. † p. 97. ‡ p. 3. § p. 97.
‖ p. 3. ¶ p. 3. ** p. 15.

no design either to confute or to contradict myself in these words. The former sentence is spoken of the Moravian brethren: the latter, of the English brethren of Fetter-lane.

12. You need not therefore * "imagine, that either the strong pretences or warm professions of the Moravians, or their agreeing with me in some favourite topics, (for my love to them was antecedent to any such *agreement,)* induce me to overlook their iniquity, and to forgive their other crimes." No. I love them upon quite different grounds: even, because I believe (notwithstanding all their faults) they *love the* Lord Jesus *in sincerity*, and have a measure of *the mind that was in* him. And I am *in* great *earnest when I declare* once more, That I have a deep, abiding conviction, by how many degrees the good which is among them overbalances the evil: That I cannot speak of them but with *tender affection*, were it only for the benefits I have received from them: and that at this hour, *I desire union with them* (were those stumbling-blocks once put away, which have hitherto made that desire ineffectual) *above all things under heaven.*

II. 1. Your second charge is, "That I hold, in common with them, principles from which their errors naturally follow." You mean, justification by faith alone. To set things in the clearest light I can, I will, first, observe, what I hold, and what you object, and then inquire, what the consequences have been?

First, As to what I hold, my latest thoughts upon justification, are expressed in the following words: † 'Justification sometimes means our acquittal at the last day. But this is out of the present question: that justification whereof our Articles and Homilies speak, meaning present pardon, and acceptance with God: who therein *declares his righteousness and mercy*, by or *for the remission of the sins* that are past.' 'I believe, the condition of this is faith: I

* Remarks, p. 23.

† Farther Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion, Vol. XII. p. 47, 48, 49.

mean not only, that without faith we cannot be justified: but also, that as soon as any one has true faith, in that moment he is justified.' 'Good works follow this faith, but cannot go before it. Much less can sanctification, which implies a continued course of good works, springing from holiness of heart. But, entire sanctification goes before our justification at the last day.

'It is allowed, that repentance and *fruits meet for repentance*, go before faith. Repentance *absolutely* must go before faith: *fruits meet for it*, if there be opportunity. By *repentance* I mean, conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment: and by *fruits meet for repentance*, forgiving our brother, ceasing from evil, doing good, using the ordinances of God, and in general, obeying him according to the measure of grace which we have received. But these I cannot, as yet, term *good works*; because they do not spring from faith and the love of God.'

2. 'Faith in general is a divine, supernatural ἔλεγχος (evidence or conviction) of things not seen, not discoverable by our bodily senses, as being either past, future, or spiritual. Justifying faith implies, not only a divine ἔλεγχος, that *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself*, but a sure trust and confidence, that Christ died for *my* sins, that he loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*. And the moment a *penitent* sinner *thus* believes, God *pardons* and absolves him.'

* 'Now, it being allowed, that both inward and outward holiness are the stated conditions of final justification: what more can you desire, who have hitherto opposed *justification by faith alone*, merely upon a principle of conscience; because you were zealous for holiness and good works? Do I not effectually secure these from contempt, at the same time that I defend the doctrines of the church? I not only allow, but vehemently contend, that none shall ever enter into glory, who is not holy on earth, as well in heart, as *in all*

* Farther Appeal, &c. Vol. XII. p. 58, 59.

manner of conversation. I cry aloud, 'Let all that have believed, be careful to maintain good works:' and, 'Let every one that nameth the name of Christ, depart from all iniquity.' I exhort even those who are conscious they do not believe, 'Cease to do evil, learn to do well.' 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand;' therefore, 'repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance.' Are not these directions the very same, in substance, which you yourself would give to persons so circumstanced?

3. 'Many of those who are perhaps as zealous of good works as you, think I have allowed you too much: nay, my brethren, but how can we help allowing it, if we allow the Scriptures to be from God? For is it not written, and do not you yourselves believe, 'Without holiness no man shall see the Lord?' And how then, without fighting about words, can we deny, that holiness is a condition of final acceptance? And as to the first acceptance or pardon, does not all experience as well as Scripture prove, that no man ever yet truly *believed the gospel*, who did not first *repent?* Repentance, therefore, we cannot deny, to be necessarily previous to faith. Is it not equally undeniable, that the running back into wilful known sin, (suppose it were drunkenness or uncleanness,) stifles that repentance or conviction? And can that repentance come to any good issue in his soul, who resolves, not to forgive his brother? Or who obstinately refrains from what God convinces him is right, whether it be prayer, or hearing his word? Would you scruple yourself to tell one of these, 'Unto him that hath shall be given: but from him that hath not,' i. e. uses it not, 'shall be taken even that which he hath?' Would you scruple to say this?—But in saying this, you allow all which I have said, viz. That previous to justifying faith, there *must* be 'repentance,' and if opportunity permit, 'fruits meet for repentance.'

'And yet I allow you this, That although both repentance and the fruits thereof are in *some sense* necessary before justification, yet neither the one nor the other is necessary in the *same sense*, or in the *same degree* with

faith; for in whatever moment a man believes, (in the Christian sense of the word,) he is justified, his sins are blotted out, 'his faith is counted to him for righteousness.' But it is not so, at whatever moment he repents, or brings forth any or all the fruits of repentance. Faith alone therefore justifies; which repentance alone does not; much less any outward work. And, consequently, none of these are necessary to justification, in the *same degree* with faith.

'Nor in the *same sense*. For none of these has so direct immediate a relation to justification as faith. This is *proximately* necessary thereto; repentance, *remotely*, as it is necessary to the increase or continuance of faith. And even in this sense, these are only necessary on supposition, if there be time and opportunity for them: for in many instances there is not; but God cuts short his work, and faith prevents the fruits of repentance. So that the general proposition is not overthrown, but clearly established by these concessions; and we conclude still, That faith alone is the proximate condition of justification."

4. This is what I hold concerning justification. I am next briefly to observe what you object. † "If faith, say you, is the sole condition of justification, then it is our sole duty." I deny the consequence. Faith may be (in the sense above described) the sole condition of justification, and yet not only repentance be our duty *before*, but all obedience *after* we believe.

You go on. "If ‡ good works are not conditions of our justification, they are not conditions of our (final) salvation." I deny the consequence again. *Good works*, (properly so called,) cannot be the conditions of justification: because it is impossible to do any good work *before* we are justified. And yet, notwithstanding, good works may be (and are) conditions of final salvation. For

† Remarks, p. 25. ‡ Ibid.

who will say it is impossible to do any good work, *before* we are finally saved?

You proceed. * "Can we be saved, in the contemptuous neglect of repentance, prayer, &c.?" No: nor justified neither; but while they are previous to faith, these are not allowed to be *good works*.

You afterwards argue from my own concessions thus:—"† Your notion of true stillness is, 'A patient waiting upon God, by lowliness, meekness, resignation, in all the ways of his holy law, and the works of his commandments.'—But how is it possible to reconcile to this the position, that these duties are not conditions of our justification? If we are justified without them, we may be saved without them.—This consequence cannot be too often repeated."

Let it be repeated ever so often, it is good for nothing. For, far other qualifications are required, in order to our standing before God in glory, than were required in order to his giving us faith and pardon. In order to this, nothing is *indispensably* required, but repentance, or conviction of sin. But in order to the other it is indispensably required, that we be fully *cleansed from all sin*: that the very God *of peace* sanctify us wholly, even το ολοκληρον ημων, our entire body, soul, and spirit. It is not necessary therefore (nor indeed possible, that we should *before* justification, *patiently wait upon God, by lowliness, meekness, and resignation, in all the ways of his holy law*. And yet it is necessary in the highest degree, that we should thus wait upon him *after* justification. Otherwise, how shall we be 'meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light?'

5. Soon after you add, ‡ "In the passages last cited, you plead for the necessity of a good life. But in others, the force of your principles shews itself.—An answer approved by you is, 'My heart is desperately wicked. But I have no doubt or fear. I know my Saviour loves me and I love him.'—Both these particulars are impossible, if the Scripture be true."

* Remarks, p. 26. † p. 26. ‡ p. 29.

You amaze me! Is it possible you should be ignorant, that your own heart is desperately wicked? Yet I dare not say, either that God does not love you; or that you do not love him.

* "Again, you say, 'you described the state of those who have forgiveness of sins, but not a clean heart;'" (not in the full, proper sense.) Very true: but even then, they had power over both inward and outward corruptions: far from being, as you suppose, "still wedded to their vices, and resolved to continue in them."

† "In another place, after having observed, that 'Sin does *remain* in one that is justified, though it has not *dominion* over him,' you go on, 'But fear not, though you have an evil heart; yet a little while and you shall be endued with power from on high, whereby ye may purify yourselves, even as he is pure.'—Sinners, if they believe this, may be quite secure, and imagine they have nothing to fear, though they continue in their iniquities.—For God's sake, Sir, speak out.—If they that have an evil heart have not, who has reason to fear?"—All who have not *dominion* over sin: all who *continue in their iniquities*. You, for one, if any sin has dominion over you. If so, I testify against you this day, (and you will not be *quite secure, if you believe me)* 'The wrath of God abideth on you!'

‡ "What do you mean by 'Sin remains in one that is justified?' That he is guilty of any known, wilful, habitual sin?"—Judge by what has gone before:—I mean the same as our church means, by "Sin remains in the regenerate."

6. You proceed to another passage, which in the Journal stands thus: § 'After we had wandered many years, in the *new path* of *salvation by faith and works*, about two years ago it pleased God, to shew us the *old way* of *salvation by faith only*. And many soon tasted of this *salvation*, being justified freely, having *peace* with God, *rejoicing* in hope of the glory of God, and having his love shed abroad in

* Remarks, p. 30. † p. 31. ‡ p. 32. § Vol. II. p. 37.

their hearts.' Thus I define what I mean by *this salvation*, viz. righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

But you object, * "Here you deny the necessity of *good works* in order to salvation." I deny the necessity, nay possibility, of *good works* as previous to *this* salvation; as previous to faith or those fruits of faith, righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. This is my *real sentiment*, not *a slip of my pen*, neither *any proof of my* want of accuracy.

7. † "I shall now," you say, "consider the account you give in this journal, of the doctrine of justification."

I will recite the whole, just as it stands, together with the occasion of it.—'In ‡ the afternoon I was informed, how many who cannot, in terms, deny it—*explain* justification by faith. They say 1. Justification is *two-fold;* the *first*, in this life, the *second*, at the last day. 2. Both these are by *faith alone*, that is, by *objective faith*, or by the merits of Christ which are the object of our faith. And this, they say, is all that St. Paul and the church mean by, 'We are justified by faith only.' But they add, 3. We are not justified by *subjective faith* alone, that is, by the faith which is in us. But good works also must be added to this faith, as a *joint* condition both of the *first* and *second* justification.

'In flat opposition to this, I cannot but maintain (at least till I have clearer light) 1. That the justification which is spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and in our articles, is not two-fold. It is one and no more. It is the present remission of our sins, or our first acceptance with God. 2. It is true, that the merits of Christ are the sole cause of this our justification. But it is not true, that this is all which St. Paul and our church mean, by our being justified by faith only: neither is it true, that either St. Paul or the church mean by faith, the merits of Christ. But, 3. By our being justified by faith only, both St. Paul and the church mean, that the condition of our justification, is faith alone, and not good works: inasmuch as all works done before

* Remarks, p. 33. † p. 30. ‡ Vol. II. p. 13, 14.

justification, have in them the nature of sin. Lastly, That faith which is the sole condition of justification, is the faith which is wrought in us, by the grace of God. It is a sure trust which a man hath, that Christ hath loved *him* and died for *him*.'

8. To the first of these propositions you object, "That * justification is not only two-fold, but manifold. For a man may possibly sin many times, and as many times be justified or forgiven."

I grant it. I grant also, that justification sometimes means, a *state* of acceptance with God. But all this does not in the least affect my assertion, that '*that justification* which is spoken of by St. Paul to the Romans, and by our church in the 11th, 12th, and 13th articles, is not *our acquittal* at the last day, but the *present remission* of our sins."

You add, † "You write in other places so variously about this matter, that I despair to find any consistency. Once you held 'a degree of justifying faith, short of *the full assurance* of faith, the *abiding witness* of the Spirit, or the clear perception that Christ abideth in him.'—And yet you afterwards 'warned all, not to think they were justified, before they had a *clear assurance*, That God had forgiven their sins.'—What difference there is between this *clear assurance*, and the former *full assurance* and *clear perception*, I know not."

Let us go on step by step, and you will know. "Once you held a '*Degree* of justifying faith, short of the *full assurance* of faith, *the abiding* witness of the Spirit, or the *clear perception that Christ abideth* in him.'" And so I hold still, and have done for some years. "And yet you afterwards, 'warned all, not to think they were justified, before they had a clear assurance that God had forgiven their sins.'"—I did so.—"What difference there is between this *clear assurance*, and that *full assurance* and *clear perception*, I know not."—Sir, I will tell you: The one is, an *assurance*

* Remarks, p. 37, 38, 39. † p. 40.

that *my* sins are forgiven, *clear* at first, but soon clouded with doubt or fear. The other is, such a plerophory, or full assurance, that I am forgiven, and so clear a perception, that Christ abideth in me, as utterly excludes all doubt and fear, and leaves them no place, no not for an hour. So that the difference between them is as great as the difference between the light of the morning and that of the mid-day sun.

9. On the second proposition you remark, 1. That * "I ought to have said the merits of Christ, are (not the *sole* cause, but) the *sole meritorious* cause of this our justification. 2. That St. Paul and the church, by justifying *faith* mean, faith in the gospel and merits of Christ." The very thing; as I contend, in flat opposition to those, who say they mean, only the object of this faith.

Upon the third proposition, 'By our being justified by faith only, both St. Paul and the church mean, that the condition of our justification is *faith alone*, and not good works:' You say, † "Neither of them mean any such thing. You greatly wrong them in ascribing so mischievous a sentiment to them." Let me beg you, Sir, to have patience, and calmly to consider, 1. What I mean by this proposition. Why should you any longer run as uncertainly, and fight as one that beateth the air? 2. What is advanced touching the sentiments of the church, in the tract referred to above. Till you have done this, it would be mere loss of time to dispute with you on this head.

I wave, therefore, for the present, the consideration of some of your following pages. Only I cannot quite pass over that (I believe, new) assertion, ‡ "That the 13th Article, intitled, 'Of Works done before Justification,' does not speak of works done *before justification*, but of works *before grace*, which is a very different thing!" I beseech you, Sir, to consider the 11th, 12th, and 13th articles, just as they lie, in one view. And you cannot but see, that it is as absolutely impossible to maintain that proposition, as

* Remarks, p. 41. † Ibid. ‡ p. 45.

it is to prove, that the 11th and 12th articles *speak not of justification*, but of some *very different thing*.

10. Against that part of the 4th proposition, 'faith is a sure trust which a man hath, that Christ loved *him* and died for *him*:' you object, * "This definition is absurd; as it supposes that such a sure trust can be in one who does not repent of his sins."---I suppose quite the contrary, as I have declared over and over: nor, therefore, is there any such *danger* as you apprehend.

But you say, † "There is nothing distinguishing enough in this, to point out the true justifying faith." I grant it: supposing a man were to write a book, and say this of it, and no more. But did you ever see any treatise of mine, wherein I said this of faith, and no more? Nothing whereby to distinguish *true* faith from *false*? Touching this journal, your own quotations prove the contrary. Yea, and I every where insist, that we are to distinguish them by *their fruits*, by inward and outward *righteousness*, by the *peace* of God filling and ruling the heart, and by patient, active *joy* in the Holy Ghost.

You conclude this point: ‡ "I have now, Sir, examined at large your account of justification; and I hope fully refuted the several articles in which you have comprized it." —We differ in our judgment. I do not apprehend, you have *refuted* any one proposition of the four. You have indeed amended the second, by adding the word *meritorious*; for which I give you thanks.

11. You next give what you stile § "The Christian scheme of justification," and afterwards point out the consequences, which you apprehend to have attended the preaching justification by faith: the third point into which I was to inquire.

You open the cause thus: ‖ "The denying the necessity of good works, as the condition of justification, directly draws after it, or rather includes in it, all manner of impiety and vice.—It has often perplexed and disturbed the minds

* Remarks, p. 48. † Ibid. ‡ p. 49. § p. 50. ‖ p. 1, 2.

†

of men, and in the last century occasioned great confusions in this nation.—These are points which are ever liable to misconstructions, and have ever yet been more or less attended with them. And it appears from what you have lately published, that since you have preached the doctrine, it has had its old consequences, or rather worse ones: it has been more misunderstood, more perverted and abused than ever.

"The denying the necessity of good works, as the condition of justification, draws after it, or rather includes in it, all manner of impiety and vice." Here stands the proposition: but where is the proof? Till that appears, I simply say, *It does not.*

"It has often perplexed and disturbed the minds of men." And so have many other points in St. Paul's epistles.

But "these are points which are ever liable to misconstructions, and have ever yet, more or less been attended with them."—And what points of revealed religion are those, which are not ever liable to misconceptions? Or of what material point can we say, that it has not ever yet, more or less, been attended with them?

"In the last century it occasioned great confusions in this nation."—It occasioned! No; in no wise. It is demonstrable, the occasions of those confusions were quite of another kind.

"And it appears—That since you have preached the doctrine, it has had its old consequences, or rather worse. It has been more misunderstood, more perverted and abused than ever."—What! Worse consequences than regicide, (which you say, was the old one) and making our whole land a field of blood? Or has it been more perverted and abused, than when (in your account) it overturned the whole frame both of church and state?

12. You go on. * "The terms of the gospel are, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.—But when we undervalue either of these terms,

* Remarks, p. 2.

we involve the consciences of the weak in fatal perplexities; we give a handle to others to justify their impieties; we confirm the enemies of religion in their prejudices."

All this I grant; but it affects not me. For I do not undervalue either faith or repentance.

* "Was not irreligion and vice already prevailing enough in the nation, but we must—throw snares in people's way, and root out the remains of piety and devotion, in the weak and well-meaning? That this has been the case, your own confessions put beyond all doubt. And you even now hold and teach the principles, from which these dangerous consequences do plainly and directly follow."

"Was not irreligion and vice already prevailing enough" (whether I have increased them, we will consider by and by)—"but we must throw snares in people's way."—God forbid! My whole life is employed in taking those snares out of people's way, which the world and the devil have thrown there.—"And root out the remains of piety and devotion in the weak and well-meaning?" Of whom speaketh the prophet this? Of himself? Or of some other man?—"Your own confessions put this beyond all doubt."—What? That "I root out the remains of piety and devotion?" Not so. The sum of them all (recited above) amounts to this and no more: "That while my brother and I were absent from London, many weak men were tainted with wrong opinions: most of whom we recovered at our return: but even those who continued therein, did notwithstanding continue to live a holier life, than ever they did before they heard us preach.' "And you even now hold the principles from which these dangerous consequences do plainly and directly follow." But I know not where to find these consequences—Unless it be in your title-page: there, indeed, I read of the very fatal tendency of justification by faith only, "the divisions and perplexities of the Methodists, and the many errors relating

* Remarks, p. 3.

both to faith and practice which" (as you conceive) "have already arisen among these deluded people."

However * "you charitably believe, I was not aware of these consequences at first." No, nor am I yet: though it is strange I should not, if they "so naturally succeed that doctrine." I will go a step farther. I do not know, neither believe, that they ever did *succeed that doctrine:* unless perhaps *accidentally;* as they might have succeeded any doctrine whatsoever. And till the contrary is proved, those consequences cannot *shew,* that *these principles are not true.*

13. Another consequence which you charge on my preaching justification by faith, is, the introducing the errors of the Moravians. † "Had the people," say you, "gone on in a quiet and regular practice of their duty, as most of them did before you deluded them, it would have been impossible for the Moravian tenets to have prevailed among them. But when they had been long and often used to hear good works undervalued; I cannot wonder that they should plunge into new errors, and wax worse and worse."

This is one string of mistakes. "Had the people gone on in a quiet and regular practice of their duty, as most of them did before you deluded them." Deluded them! Into what? Into the love of God and all mankind, and a zealous care to keep his commandments. I would to God this delusion, (if such it is accounted,) may spread to the four corners of the earth! But how did most of them go on before they were thus deluded? Four in five, by a moderate computation, even as other baptized Heathens; in the works of the devil, in all the wretchedness of unclean living.—"In a quiet and regular practice of their duty!"—What duty? The duty of cursing and swearing! The duty of gluttony and drunkenness! The duty of whoredom and adultery! Or of beating one another, and any that came in their way? In this, (not very quiet or regular)

* Remarks, p. 4. † p. 12.

practice, did most of those *go on before* they heard us, who have now *put off the old man with his deeds*, and are holy in all manner of conversation.

Have these, think you, "been long and often used to hear good works undervalued?" Or, are they *prepared for* receiving the Moravian errors, by the knowledge and love of God? O Sir, the Moravians know, if you do not, that there is no such barrier under heaven against their tenets, as those very people, whom you suppose just prepared for receiving them.

But "complaints," (you say) "of their errors, come very ill from you, because you have occasioned them." Nay, if it were so, for that very cause they ought to *come* from me. If I had *occasioned* an evil, surely I am the very person, who ought to *remove* it as far as I can: to recover, if possible, those who are hurt already, and to caution others against it.

14. On some of those complaints (as you term them) you remark as follows: * "Many of those who once knew in whom they had believed" (these are my words) "were thrown into idle reasonings, and thereby filled with doubts and fears." "This," you add, "it is to be feared, has been too much the case of the Methodists in general. Accordingly we find in this journal, several instances not barely of doubts and fears, but of the most desperate despair. This is the consequence of resting so much on sensible impressions. Bad men may be led into presumption thereby: an instance of which you give, p. 66."

That instance will come in our way again. "Many of those who once knew in whom they had believed, were thrown (by the Antinomians) into idle reasonings, and thereby filled with doubts and fears. This, *you* fear, has been the case with the Methodists in general." You must mean (to make it a parallel case) 'That the generality of the people, now termed Methodists, were true believers till they heard us preach; but *were* thereby *thrown into idle*

* Remarks, p. 13.

reasonings, and filled with needless *doubts and fears.*' Exactly contrary to truth in every particular. For 1. They lived in open sins *till they heard us preach*, and consequently were no better *believers* than their father, the devil. 2. They were not then thrown into *idle reasonings*, but into *serious thought*, how to flee from the wrath to come. Nor 3. were they filled with *needless doubts and fears;* but with such as were *needful* in the highest degree; such as actually issued in repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Accordingly we find in this journal several instances of the most desperate despair:" Vol. II. p. 21, 34, 59. Then I am greatly mistaken. But I will set down at length the several instances you refer to.

Page 21. 'I was a little surprised in going out of the room, at one who catched hold of me, and said abruptly, "I must speak with you and will. I have sinned against light and against love." (N. B. She was soon after, if not at that very time, a common prostitute) "I have sinned beyond forgiveness. I have been cursing you in my heart, and blaspheming God, ever since I came here. I am damned. I know it. I feel it. I am in hell. I have hell in my heart." I desired two or three who had confidence in God, to join in crying to him on her behalf. Immediately that horrible dread was taken away, and she began to see some dawnings of hope.'

Page 34. 'The attention of all was soon fixed, on poor L—— S——. One so violently and variously torn of the evil one, did I never see before. Sometimes, she laughed till almost strangled; and then broke out into cursing and blaspheming; then stamped and struggled with incredible strength, so that four or five could scarcely hold her: then cried out, "O eternity! eternity! O that I had no soul! O that I had never been born!" At last she faintly called on Christ to help her. And the violence of her pangs ceased." (It should be remembered, that from that time to this, her conversation has been as becometh the gospel.)

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] "societies against the Church," is a charge which I need not examine till the [illegible] produced. You next cite a Moravian's words to me, (an Englishman joined with the Moravians,) "You have your hell of adultery, and cannot cease from sin; you take upon you to guide unstable souls, and lead them in the way of damnation!" and remark, "This is only returning some of your own treatment upon yourself. Here also you set the pattern." At what time and place? When and where were "such abuses as these thrown out by me, against our institution, and against our regular clergy, not the highest or the worthiest excepted?" I am altogether clear in this matter, as often as it has been objected: neither

* Remarks, p. 1[illegible]

do I desire to receive any other treatment from the clergy, than they have received from me to this day.

You have a note at the bottom of this page which runs thus: "See page 71, 77, and 78, where some Methodists said, they had heard both your brother and you many times preach popery." I am afraid, you advance here a wilful untruth, purely *ad movendam invidiam*. For you cannot but know, 1. That there is not one word of *preaching popery*, either in the 71st or 77th page: and, 2. That when Mr. C. and two other Predestinarians (as is related, p. 73) affirmed, 'They had heard both my brother and me many times preach popery,' they meant neither more nor less thereby, than the doctrine of General Redemption.

16. You proceed, * "Kingswood you call your own house. And when one Mr. C. opposed you there, you reply to him, 'You should not have supplanted me in my own house, stealing the hearts of the people.' The parochial clergy may call their several districts their *own houses*, with much more propriety than you could call Kingswood yours. And yet how have you supplanted them therein, and laboured to steal the hearts of the people. You have suffered by the same ways you took to discharge your spleen and malice against your brethren.

"Your brother's words to Mr. C. are, 'Whether his doctrine is true or false is not the question. But you ought first to have fairly told him, I preach contrary to you. Are you willing notwithstanding, that I should continue *in your house*, gainsaying you? Shall I stay here opposing you, or shall I depart?' Think you hear this spoken to *you* by *us*:—What can you justly reply? Again, if Mr. C. had said thus to you, and you had refused him leave to stay; I ask you, whether in such a case he would have had reason to resent such a refusal? I think you cannot say he would. And yet how loudly have you objected our refusing our pulpits to you!"

So you judge these to be exactly parallel cases. It lies

* Remarks, p. 15.

therefore upon me to shew, that they are not parallel at all: that there is, in many respects, an essential difference between them.

1. "Kingswood you call your own house." So I do, that is, the school-house there. For I bought the ground where it stands, and paid for the building it, partly from the contribution of my friends (one of whom contributed fifty pounds) partly from the income of my own fellowship. No clergyman therefore can call his parish *his own house* with *more propriety* than I can call this house *mine*.

2. "Mr. C. opposed you there." True: but who was Mr. C.? One I had sent for to *assist me there*; a friend that was as my own soul; that even while he opposed me, lay in my bosom. What resemblance then does Mr. C. *thus* opposing *me*, bear to *me* opposing (if I really did) a *parochial minister*?

3. "You said to Mr. C. 'You should not have supplanted me in my own house, stealing the hearts of the people.' Yet you have suppalnted the clergy in their own houses"—*What!* in the *same manner* as Mr. C. did *me*? Have I done to any of *them*, as he has done to *me*? You may as justly say, I have cut their throats? "Stealing the hearts of their people."---Nor are these *their* people in the *same sense* wherein those were *mine*, viz. Servants of the devil brought through my ministry, to be servants and children of God. "You have suffered by the same ways you took to discharge your spleen and malice against your brethren."—"To discharge your spleen and malice!" Say, your muskets and blunderbusses. I have just as much to do with one as the other.

4. "Your brother said to Mr. C., 'You ought to have told my brother fairly, I preach contrary to you. Are you willing I should continue in your house, gain-saying you? Shall I stay here opposing you, or shall I depart?' Think you hear this spoken to *you* by *us*.—What can you justly reply?" I can justly reply, 'Sir, Mr. C.'s case totally differs from *your's*. Therefore it makes absolutely nothing to your purpose.'

17. A farther consequence (you think) of my preaching this doctrine, is "the * introducing that of absolute predestination. And whenever these errors," say you, "gain ground, there can be no wonder, that confusion, presumption, and despair, many very shocking instances of all which you give us among your followers, should be the consequences." You should by all means have specified a few of those instances, or at least, the pages where they occur. Till this is done, I can look upon this assertion, as no other than a flourish of your pen.

To conclude this head. You roundly affirm once for all, † "The grossest corruptions have ever followed the spreading of this tenet. The greatest heats and animosities have been raised thereby. The widest errors have been thus occasioned. And in proportion to its getting ground, it has never failed—to perplex the weak, to harden the wicked, and to please the profane. Your Journal is a proof, that these terrible consequences have of late prevailed, perhaps more than ever." Suppose that Journal gives a true account of facts (which you seem not to deny) could you find there no other fruits of my preaching, than these terrible ones you here mention?

'O who so blind, as he that *will* not see?'

18. But that we may not still talk at large, let us bring this question, into as narrow a compass as possible. Let us go no farther, as to time, than seven years last past; as to place, than London and the parts adjoining: as to persons, than you and me, Thomas Church preaching one doctrine, John Wesley, the other. Now then let us consider with meekness and fear, what have been the consequences of each doctrine?

You have preached *justification by faith and works*, at Battersea and St. Ann's, Westminster; while I preached *justification by faith alone*, near Moorfields, and at Short's Gardens. I beseech you then to consider, in the secret of your heart, how many sinners have you converted to God? By their fruits we shall know them. This is a plain rule.

* Remarks, p. 52 † p. 51.

By this test let them be tried. How many outwardly and habitually wicked men, have you brought to uniform habits of outward holiness? It is an awful thought! Can you instance in a hundred? In fifty? In twenty? In ten?—If not, take heed unto yourself and to your doctrine. It cannot be, that both are right before God.

Consider now, (I would not speak; but I dare not refrain,) what have been the consequences of even my preaching the other doctrine? By the fruits shall we know those of whom I speak: even the cloud of witnesses, who at this hour experience the gospel I preach, to be the power of God unto salvation. The habitual drunkard, that was, is now temperate in all things. The whoremonger, now flees fornication. He that stole, steals no more, but works with his hands. He that cursed or swore, perhaps at every sentence, has now learned to serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice unto him with reverence. Those formerly enslaved to various habits of sin, are now brought to uniform habits of holiness. These are demonstrable facts. I can name the men, with their several places of abode. One of them was an avowed Atheist for many years; some were Jews; a considerable number Papists: the greatest part of them as much strangers to the form, as to the power of godliness.

When you have weighed these things touching the consequences of *my preaching*, on the one hand, (somewhat different from those set down in your Remarks,) and of *your preaching* on the other, I would earnestly recommend the following words to your deepest consideration: *Beware of false prophets; ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree* (every true prophet or teacher) *bringeth forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire.**

III. 1. Having spoken more largely than I designed, on the principle *I hold in common with the Moravians*, I shall

* Matt. vi. 15, &c.

touch very briefly on * *those errors* (so called) which, you say, I *hold, more than theirs.*

"You name, as the first, my holding, 'that a † man may have a *degree* of justifying faith, before he has, in the *full, proper* sense, a new, a *clean heart.*'"

I have so often explained this, that I cannot throw away time in adding any more now: only this, That the moment a sinner is justified, his *heart* is *cleansed* in a *low degree.* But yet he has not a clean heart, in the *full, proper sense,* till he is made *perfect in love.*

2. Another error you mention, is this § "doctrine of perfection." To save you from a continued *ignoratio elenchi.* I wave disputing on this point also, till you are better acquainted with my real sentiments. I have declared them on that head again and again; particularly in the sermon on Christian Perfection.

3. Into this fallacy you plunge from the beginning to the end of what you speak on my third *error,* (so you term it,) relating to the Lord's Supper; confuting, as mine, ‖ notions which I know not. I cannot think any farther answer is needful here, than the bare recital of my own words.

¶ 'Frid. June 27. I preached on, *Do this in remembrance of me.*

'It has been diligently taught among us, that none but those who are converted, who have received the Holy Ghost, who are believers in the full sense, ought to communicate.

'But experience shews the gross falshood of that assertion, That the Lord's Supper is not a converting ordinance. Ye are witnesses. For many now present know, the very beginning of your *conversion* to God, (perhaps, in some the first deep *conviction,*) was brought at the Lord's Supper. Now one single instance of this kind, overthrows that whole assertion.

'The falsehood of the other assertion appears both from Scripture precept, and example. Our Lord commanded

* † Remarks, p. 55. § p. 60. ‖ p. 56, 57. ¶ Journal, Vol. II. p. 42.

those very men who were then *unconverted*, who had *not* yet *received the Holy Ghost*, who (in the full sense of the word) were not *believers*, to *do this in remembrance of him*. Here the precept is clear. And to these he delivered the elements with his own hands. Here is example equally indisputable.

'Sat. 28. I shewed at large, 1. That the Lord's Supper was ordained by God, to be a *means of conveying* to men, either *preventing*, or *justifying*, or *sanctifying grace*, according to their several necessities. 2. That the persons for whom it was ordained, are all those who know and feel that they want the grace of God, either to *restrain* them from sin, or to *shew their sins forgiven*, or to *renew their souls* in the image of God. 3. That inasmuch as we come to his table, not to give him any thing, but to receive whatsoever he sees best for us, there is no previous preparation indispensably necessary; but a desire to receive whatsoever he pleases to give. And, 4. That no fitness is required at the time of communicating, but a sense of our state, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness; every one who knows he is fit for hell, being just fit to come to Christ, in this as well as all other ways of his appointment.'

4. * "A stoical insensibility," you add, "is the next error I have to charge you with. You say, 'The servants of God suffer nothing,' and suppose, that we ought to be here so free, as in the strongest pain, not once to desire to have a moment's ease.

"At the end of one of your hymns, you seem to carry this notion to the very height of extravagance and presumption. You say,

'Doom, if thou canst, to endless pains,
And drive me from thy face.'

"A stoical insensibility is the next error I have to charge you with" And how do you support the charge? Why thus: "You say, † 'The servants of God suffer nothing.'" And can you possibly misunderstand these words, if you

* Remarks, p. 58. † Vol. II. p. 54.

read those that immediately follow? 'His body was well nigh torn asunder with pain. But God made all his bed in his sickness. So that he was continually giving thanks to God, and making his boast of his praise.'

"You suppose, we ought to be so free, as in the strongest pain, not once to desire to have a moment's ease." O Sir, with what eyes did you read those words?

* 'I dined with one who told me in all simplicity, Sir, I thought last week, there could be no such rest as you describe; none in this world, wherein we should be so free, as not to desire ease in pain. But God has taught me better: for on Friday and Saturday, when I was in the strongest pain, I never once had one moment's desire of ease, but only that the will of God might be done.' Do I say here, that "we ought not, in the strongest pain, once to desire to have a moment's ease?" What a frightful distortion of my words is this! What I say is, 'A serious person affirmed to me, that God kept her for two days in such a state.' And why not? Where is the absurdity?

"At the end of one of your hymns, you seem to carry this notion, to the very height of extravagancy and presumption. You say,

'Doom, if thou canst, to endless pains,
And drive me from thy face.'"

"If thou canst"—i. e. *If thou canst* deny thyself, *if thou canst* forget to be gracious, *if thou canst* cease to be truth and love. So the lines, both preceding and following, fix the sense. I see nothing of "stoical insensibility," neither of "extravagancy or presumption" in this.

5. Your last charge is, that I am "guilty of enthusiasm to the highest degree. † Enthusiasm (you say) is a false persuasion of an extraordinary divine assistance, which leads men on to such conduct as is only to be justified by the supposition of such assistance. An enthusiast is then sincere, but mistaken. His intentions are good—but his actions most abominable. Instead of making the word of God the rule of his actions, he follows only that secret im-

* Vol. II. p. 46. † Remarks, p. 60, 61.

pulse which is owing to a warm imagination. Instead of judging of his spiritual estate by the improvement of his heart, he rests only on ecstacies, &c. He is very liable to err, as not considering things coolly and carefully. He is very difficult to be convinced, by reason and argument, as he acts upon a supposed principle superior to it, the directions of God's Spirit. Whoever opposes him is charged with rejecting the Spirit. His own dreams must be regarded as oracles. Whatever he does, is to be accounted the work of God. Hence he talks in the style of inspired persons: and applies Scripture phrases to himself, without attending to their original meaning, or once considering the difference of times and circumstances."

You have drawn, Sir, (in the main,) a true picture of an *enthusiast*. But it is no more like me, than I am like a centaur. Yet you say, "they are these very things which have been charged upon you, and which you could never yet disprove:" I will try for once; and to that end, will go over these articles, one by one.

"Enthusiasm is a false persuasion of an extraordinary divine assistance, which leads men on to such conduct as is only to be justified by the supposition of such assistance." Before this touches *me*, you are to prove, (which I conceive you have not done yet,) that *my* conduct is such, as is only to be justified by the supposition of an extraordinary divine assistance. "An enthusiast is then sincere, but mistaken," that I am "mistaken" remains also to be proved. "His intentions are good; but his actions most abominable." Sometimes they are; yet not *always*. For there may be *innocent* madmen. But what actions of mine are "most abominable?" I wait to learn. "Instead of making the word of God the rule of his actions, he follows only his secret impulse." In the whole compass of language, there is not a proposition which less belongs to me than this. I have declared again and again, that I make the Word of God the rule of all my actions: and that I no more follow any "secret impulse" instead thereof, than I follow Mahomet or Confucius.

"Not even a word or look
Do I approve or own,
But by the model of thy book,
Thy sacred book alone."

"Instead of judging of his spiritual estate by the improvement of his heart, he rests only on ecstasies." Neither is this my case. I rest not on them at all. Nor did I ever experience any. I do judge of my spiritual estate by the improvement of my heart and the tenor of my life conjointly. "He is very liable to err." So indeed I am. I find it every day more and more. But I do not yet find, that this is owing to my want of "considering things coolly and carefully." Perhaps you do not know many persons (excuse my simplicity in speaking it) who more carefully consider every step they take. Yet I know I am not cool or careful enough. My God, supply this and all my wants! "He is very difficult to be convinced, by reason and argument, as he acts upon a supposed principle superior to it, the direction of God's Spirit." I am very difficult to be convinced, by dry blows or hard names; (both of which I have not wanted:) but not, by reason and argument. At least that difficulty cannot spring from the cause you mention. For I claim no other direction of God's Spirit, than is common to all believers. "Whoever opposes him is charged with rejecting the Spirit." What! whoever opposes *me*, John Wesley? Do I charge every such person with rejecting the Spirit? No more than I charge him with robbing on the highway. I cite you yourself, to confute your own words. For do I charge *you* with rejecting the Spirit? "His own dreams must be regarded as oracles?" Whose? I desire neither my dreams nor my waking thoughts, may be regarded at all, unless just so far as they agree with the oracles of God. "Whatever he does is to be accounted the work of God." You strike quite wide of *me* still. I never said so of what I do. I never thought so. Yet I trust what I do is pleasing to God. "Hence he talks in the stile of inspired persons." No otherwise inspired, than you are, if you love God. "And applies

Scripture phrases to himself, without attending to their original meaning, or once considering the difference of times and circumstances." I am not conscious of any thing like this. I apply no Scripture phrase either to myself or any other, without carefully considering both its *original* meaning, and the *secondary* sense, wherein (allowing for different times and circumstances) it may be applied to ordinary Christians.

6. So much for the bulk of your charge. But it concerns me likewise, to gather up the fragments of it. You say, "* We desire no more, than to try your sentiments and proceedings, by the written word." Agreed. Begin when and where you please. "We find there good works as strongly insisted on as faith." I do as strongly insist on them as on faith. But each in its own order. "We find all railing, &c. condemned therein." True; and so you may in all I write or preach. "We are assured, that the doing what God commands, is the sure way of knowing, that we have received his Spirit." We have doubtless received it, if we love God (as he commands) with all our heart, mind, soul, and strength: "And not by any sensible impulses or feelings whatsoever."—"Any sensible impulses whatsoever?" Do you then exclude *all sensible impulses?* Do you reject *inward feelings* toto genere? Then you reject both the *love* of God and of our neighbour. For if these cannot be *inwardly felt*, nothing can. You reject all *joy* in the Holy Ghost. For if we cannot be sensible of this, it is no joy at all. You reject the peace of God, which if it be not felt in the inmost soul, is a dream, a notion, an empty name. You, therefore reject the whole *inward kingdom* of God, that is, in effect, the whole gospel of Jesus Christ.

You have, therefore, yourself abundantly shewn (what I do not *insinuate*, but proclaim on the house-top) that I am charged with *enthusiasm*, for *asserting the power* (as well as the form) *of godliness*.

* Remarks, p. 63.

7. You go on * "The character of the Enthusiast above drawn, will fit, I believe, all such of the Methodists as can be thought sincere." I believe not. I have tried it on one, and it fitted him, just as Saul's armour did David. However, *a few instances* of enthusiasm, you undertake to shew *in this very journal.*

And first, "You give us one" (these are your words) "of a private revelation, which you seem to pay great credit to." You partly relate this, and then remark, "What enthusiasm is here? To represent the conjectures of a woman, whose brain appears to have been too much heated, as if they had been owing to a particular and miraculous spirit of prophecy?" Descant, Sir, as you please on this *enthusiasm;* on the credit I paid to this private revelation: and my *representing the conjectures* of this brain-sick woman, as owing to the miraculous *power of the Spirit of* God. And when you have done, I will desire you to read that passage once more, where you will find my express words are (introducing this account) '*Sunday* 11. † I met with a surprising instance of the *power of the devil.*' Such was the *credit* I paid to this revelation! All that I ascribe to *the Spirit of God is,* the enabling her to strive against the *power of the devil,* and at length restoring peace to her soul.

8. As a second instance of enthusiasm, you cite those words, '‡ I expounded out of the fulness which was given me.' The whole sentence is, 'Out of the fulness that was given me, I expounded those words of St. Paul, (indeed of every true believer,) *To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.*' I mean, I had then a *fuller,* deeper sense of that great truth, than I *ordinarily* have. And I still think it right, to ascribe this, not to myself, but to the *giver of every good and perfect gift.*

You relate what follows as a third § "very extraordinary instance of enthusiasm." 'Tues. ‖ Feb. 17. I left London.

* Remarks, p. 63. † Vol. II. p. 61. ‡ p. 60. § Remarks, p. 65.
‖ Vol. II. p. 64.

In the afternoon I reached Oxford, and leaving my horse there (for he was tired, and the horse-road exceeding bad, and my business admitted of no delay) set out on foot for Stanton-harcourt. The night overtook me in about an hour, accompanied with heavy rain. Being wet and weary, and not well knowing my way, I could not help saying in my heart, (though ashamed of my want of resignation to God's will) O that thou wouldest *stay the bottles of heaven!* Or at least, give me light, or an honest guide! Or some help in the manner thou knowest; presently the rain ceased: the moon broke out, and a friendly man overtook me, who set me on his own horse, and walked by my side, till we came to Mr. Gambold's door.'

Here you remark, "If you would not have us look on this as miraculous, there is nothing in it worthy of being related." It may be so; let it pass then as a trifle not worth relating: but still it is no proof of enthusiasm. For I "would not have you look on it as miraculous." I do not myself look upon it as such; but as a signal instance of God's *particular providence* over all those who call upon him.

9. * "In the same spirit of enthusiasm" (you go on, citing this as a fourth instance) "You describe heaven as executing judgments, immediate punishments, on those who oppose you. You say, 'Mr. Molther was taken ill this day. I believe it was the hand of God that was upon him.'" I do. But I do not say, as a *judgment from* God for opposing me. That *you* say for me. "Again, you tell us of 'one who was exceedingly angry, at those who pretended to be in fits; and was just going to kick one of them out of the way, when she dropped down herself and was in violent agonies for an hour.' And you say you left her—under a deep sense of the *just judgment* of God." So she termed it, and so I believe it was. But observe, Not for *opposing me*. "Again, you mention 'as an awful pro-

* Remarks, p. 66.

vidence, the case of a poor wretch, who was last week cursing and blaspheming, and had boasted to many that he would come again on Sunday, and no man should stop his mouth then. (His mouth was stopped before in the midst of the most horrid blasphemies, by asking him, 'If he was stronger than God?') 'But on Friday God laid his hand upon him, and on Sunday he was buried.'" I do look on this, as a manifest judgment of God, on a hardened sinner, for his complicated wickedness. * "Again, 'one being just going to beat his wife, (which he frequently did) God smote him in a moment: so that his hand dropped, and he fell down upon the ground, having no more strength than a new-born child.'" And can you, Sir, "consider this, as one of the common dispensations of providence?" Have you known a parallel one in your life? But it was never cited by me, as it is by you, as *an immediate punishment* on a man for *opposing me*. You have no authority from any sentence or word of mine, for putting such a construction upon it: no more than you have for that strange intimation (how remote both from justice and charity!) That "I paralleled these cases, with those of Ananias and Sapphira, or of Elymas the sorcerer!"

10. You proceed to what you account a 5th instance of enthusiasm. † "With regard to people's falling in fits, it is plain, you look upon both the disorders and removals of them to be supernatural." It is not quite plain. I look upon some of these cases as wholly natural: on the rest, as mixt; both the disorder and the removal being partly natural and partly not. Six of these you pick out from, it may be, two hundred, and add, "From all which you leave no room to doubt, that you would have these cases considered, as those of the demoniacks in the New Testament; in order, I suppose, to parallel your supposed cures of them, with the highest miracles of Christ and his disciples." I should once have wondered at your making such a sup-

* Remarks, p. 67. † p. 68, 69.

position: but I now wonder at nothing of this kind. Only be pleased to remember till this supposition is made good, it is no *confirmation* at all *of my enthusiasm.*

You then attempt to account for those fits, by "obstructions or irregularities of the blood and spirits; hysterical disorders; watchings, fastings; closeness of rooms, great crowds, violent heat." And, lastly, by "terrors, perplexities, and doubts, in weak and well-meaning men;" which, you think, in many of the cases before us, have "quite overset their understandings."

As to each of the rest, let it go as far as it can go. But I require proof of the last way whereby you would account for these disorders. Why, "The instances," you say, "of religious madness, have much increased since you began to disturb the world.*" I doubt the fact. Although if these instances had increased lately, it is easy to account for them another way. "Most have heard of or known several of the Methodists thus driven to distraction." You may have *heard* of five hundred. But how many have you *known?* Be pleased to name eight or ten of them. I cannot find them, no not one of them to this day, either man, woman, or child. I find some indeed, whom *you told,* "They *would be distracted,* if they continued to follow these men:" and whom at that time you threw into much doubt, and terror, and perplexity. But though they did continue to hear them ever since, they are not distracted yet.

As for "† the abilities, learning, and experience" of Dr. M——, if you are personally acquainted with him, you do well to testify them. But if not, permit me to remind you of the old advice,

Qualem commendes, etiam atq; etiam aspice; ne mox
Incutiant aliena tibi peccata pudorem.

In endeavouring to account for the people's recovery from those disorders, you say, ‡ "I shall not dispute how far prayer may have naturally a good effect." (Nay, I am

* Remarks, p. 68, 69. † p. 70. ‡ p. 71

persuaded you will not dispute but it may have supernatural good effects also.) "However, there is no need of supposing these recoveries miraculous." Who affirms there is? I have set down the facts just as they were, passing no judgment upon them myself, (consequently here is no foundation for the charge of *enthusiasm*,) and leaving every man else to judge as he pleases.

11. The next passage you quote as a proof of my *enthusiasm*, taking the whole together runs thus: * 'After communicating at St. James's, our parish church, I visited several of the sick. Most of them were ill of the spotted fever, which they informed me, had been extremely mortal, few persons recovering from it. But God had said, *Hitherto shalt thou come*. I believe there was not one with whom we were, but recovered.' On which you comment thus: "Here is, indeed, no intimation of any thing miraculous." No! Not so much as an intimation! Then, why is this cited as an instance of my *enthusiasm*? Why, "You seem to desire to have it believed, that an extraordinary blessing attended your prayers: whereas, I believe they would not have failed of an equal blessing and success, had they had the prayers of their own parish ministers." I believe this argument will have extraordinary success, if it convince any one, that I am an *enthusiast*.

12. You add, † "I shall give but one account more, and this is, what you give of yourself." The sum whereof is, 'At two several times, being ill and in violent pain, I prayed to God and found immediate ease.' I did so. I assert the fact still. "Now if these" (you say) "are not miraculous cures, all this is rank *enthusiasm*."

I will put your argument in form;

He that believes those are miraculous cures which are not so, is a rank enthusiast:

But you believe those to be miraculous cures which are not so:

Therefore, you are a rank enthusiast.

* Vol. II. p. 56. † Remarks, p. 72.

Before I answer, I must know, what you mean by miraculous? If you term every thing so, which is not strictly to be accounted for, by the ordinary course of natural causes; then I deny the latter part of the minor proposition. And unless you can make this good, unless you can prove the effects in question may strictly be accounted for, by the *ordinary course* of natural causes, your argument is nothing worth.

You conclude this head with, * "Can you work miracles? All your present pretences to the Spirit, till they are proved by miracles, cannot be excused, or acquitted from *enthusiasm*."

My short answer is this: I pretend to the Spirit just so far, as is essential to a state of salvation. And cannot I be acquitted from enthusiasm, till I prove by miracles, that I am in a state of salvation?

13. We now draw to a period. † "The consequences of Methodism," (you say) i. e. of our preaching this doctrine, "which have hitherto appeared, are bad enough to induce you to leave it. It has, in fact, introduced many disorders. Enthusiasm, Antinomianism, Calvinism, a neglect and contempt of God's ordinances, and almost all other duties."

That whenever God revives his work upon earth, many tares will spring up with the wheat, both the word of God gives us ground to expect, and the experience of all ages. But where, Sir, have you been, that you have heard of the tares only? And that you rank among the consequences of my preaching, "A neglect and contempt of God's ordinances, and almost of all duties?" Does not the very reverse appear, at London, at Bristol, at Kingswood, at Newcastle? In every one of which places, multitudes of those (I am able to name the persons) who before lived in a thorough neglect and contempt of God's ordinances and all duties, do now zealously discharge their duties to God and man, and walk in all his ordinances blameless.

* Remarks, p. 73. † p. 75.

And as to those drunkards, whoremongers, and other servants of the devil, as they were before, who heard us a while and then fell to the Calvinists or Moravians; are they not even now in a far better state, than they were before they heard us? Admit they are in error, yea and die therein, yet who dares affirm, they will perish everlastingly? But had they died in those sins, we are sure they would have fallen into *the fire that never shall be quenched.*

I hope, Sir, you will rejoice in considering this, how much their gain still outweighs their loss; as well as in finding the sentiments you could not reconcile together, clearly and consistently explained. I am very willing to consider whatever farther you have to offer. May God give us both a right judgment in all things! I am persuaded you will readily join in this prayer with,

Reverend Sir,

Your servant for Christ's sake,

JOHN WESLEY.

BRISTOL, *Feb.* 2, 1744-5.

THE

Principles of a Methodist,

FARTHER EXPLAINED:

OCCASIONED BY THE REV. MR. CHURCH'S SECOND LETTER TO MR. WESLEY,

IN A SECOND LETTER TO THAT GENTLEMAN.

REVEREND SIR,

1. AT the time that I was reading your former letter, I expected to hear from you again. And I was not displeased with the expectation; believing it would give me a fresh opportunity of weighing the sentiments I might have too lightly espoused, and the actions which, perhaps, I had not enough considered. Viewing things in this light, I cannot but esteem you, not an enemy, but a friend; and one, in some respects, better qualified to do me real service than those whom the world accounts so; who may be hindered by their prejudice in my favour, either from observing what is reprovable, or from using that freedom and plainness of speech, which are requisite to convince me of it.

2. It is at least as much with a view to learn myself, as to shew others (what I think) the Truth, that I intend to set down a few reflections on some parts of the Tract you have lately published. I say, *some* parts; for it is not my design to answer every sentence in this, any more than in the former. Many things I pass over, because I think them true; many more, because I think them not material; and

some, because I am determined not to engage in a useless, if not hurtful controversy.

3. Fear indeed is one cause of my declining this: fear (as I said elsewhere *) not of my *adversary*, but of *myself*. I fear my own spirit, lest "I fall where many mightier have been slain." I never knew one (or but one) man write controversy with what I thought a right spirit. Every disputant seems to think (as every soldier) that he may hurt his opponent as much as he can; nay, that he *ought* to do his worst to him, or he cannot make the best of his own cause: that so he do not belie, or wilfully misrepresent him, he must expose him as much as he is able. It is enough, we suppose, if we do not shew heat or passion against our adversary. But, not to despise him, or endeavour to make others do so, is quite a work of supererogation.

4. But ought these things to be so? (I speak on the Christian scheme.) Ought we not to love our neighbour as ourselves? And does a man cease to be our neighbour, because he is of a different opinion? Nay, and declares himself to be? Ought we not, for all this, to do to him as we would he should do to us? But do we ourselves love to be *exposed*, or set in the worst light? Would we willingly be treated with contempt? If not, why do we treat others thus? And yet, who scruples it? Who does not hit every blot he can, however foreign to the merits of the cause? Who, in controversy, casts the mantle of love over the nakedness of his brother? Who keeps steadily and uniformly to the question, without ever striking at the person? Who shews in every sentence, that he loves his brother only less than the truth?

5. I fear neither you nor I have attained to this. I believe brotherly love might have found a better construction than that of *unfairness*, *art*, or *disingenuity*, to have put either on my not answering *every part* of your book, (a thing which never once entered my thoughts,) or on my not

* In the Preface to the Answer to Mr. Tucker.

reciting *all the words* of those parts which I did answer. I cannot yet perceive any blame herein. I still account it *fair* and *ingenuous*, to pass over both what I believe is right, and what I believe is not dangerously wrong. Neither can I see any *disingenuity* at all, in quoting only *that part* of any sentence, against which I conceive the objection lies: nor in *abridging* any part of any treatise to which I reply, whether in the author's, or in my own words.

6. If indeed it were so abridged as to alter the sense, this would be *unfair*. And if this were designedly done, it would be *artful* and *disingenuous*. But I am not conscious of having done this at all; although you speak as if I had done it a thousand times. And yet I cannot undertake now, either to transcribe your whole book, or every page or paragraph, which I answer. But I must generally abridge before I reply: and that not only to save time (of which I have none to spare) but often to make the argument clearer, which is best understood when couched in few words.

7. You complain also, of my mentioning all at once, sentences which you placed at a distance from each other I do so; and I think it quite *fair* and *ingenuous*, to lay together what was before scattered abroad. For instance: you now speak of the conditions of justification, in the 18th and following pages: again, from the 89th to the 102d: and yet again, in the 127th page. Now I have not leisure to follow you to and fro. Therefore what I say on one head, I set in one place.

1. 1. This premised, I come to the letter itself. I begin, as before, with the case of the Moravians: of whom you say, * "I collected together the character which you had given of these men; the errors and vices which you had charged upon them, and the mischiefs—they had done among your followers. And I proved, that, in several respects, you had been the occasion of this mischief; and are therefore, in some measure, accountable for it. Let us

* Mr. Church's words are inserted between inverted commas.

see what answer you give to all this." Second Letter, page 79.

"With regard to the denying degrees in faith, you mentioned, that 'the Moravian church was cleared from this mistake.' But did you not mention this as one of the tenets of the Moravians? Do you not say, that 'you could not agree with Mr. Spangenberg, that none has any faith, so long as he is liable to any doubt or fear?' Do not you represent Mr. Molther, and other Moravians in England, as teaching the same? In short, I have not charged the Moravian church with any thing; but only repeat after you. And if you have accused them, when you knew them to be guiltless, you must bear the blame.

"'They do use the ordinances of God with reverence and godly fear.'—You have charged Mr. Spangenberg and Mr. Molther with teaching, that we ought to abstain from them. And the same you say in general of the Moravian brethren, in your Letter to them. 'But Mr. Molther was quickly after recalled into Germany.' This might be on other accounts. You do not say it was out of any dislike of his doctrines or proceedings. Nor indeed can you, consistently with your next words: 'The great fault of the Moravian church seems to lie, in not openly disclaiming all he had said: which, in all probability, they would have done, had they not leaned to the same opinion.'

"You 'never knew but one of the Moravian church affirm, that a believer does not grow in holiness.' But who was this? No less a person than Count Zinzendorf, their great bishop and patron, whose authority is very high, all in all with them, and to whom you think they pay *too much* regard."

2. This is the whole of your reply to this part of my answer. I will now consider it, part by part.

First, "With regard to the denying degrees in faith, you mentioned, 'that the Moravian church was cleared from this mistake.' But did you not mention this as one of the tenets of the Moravians?" No; not of the Moravians in general? "Do you not say, that you 'could not agree

with Mr. Spangenberg, that none has any faith, so long as he is liable to any doubt or fear ?' " I do say so still. But Spangenberg is not the Moravian church. " Do you not represent Mr. Molther, and other Moravians in England, as teaching the same?" I do? three or four in all. But neither are these, the *Moravian church*.—" In short, I have not charged the Moravian church with any thing; but only repeat after you."—Indeed you have in the very case before us. You charge them *with denying degrees in faith*. I do not charge them herewith. I openly cleared them from any such charge near six years ago. " If therefore you have accused them when you knew them to be guiltless, you must bear the blame." In this case, I must intreat *you* to bear it in my stead. For I have not *accused them* (the Moravian church.) It is *you* that have accused them. I have again and again declared, they are *not guilty*.

Secondly, " 'They do use the ordinances of God with reverence and godly fear.' You have charged Mr. Spangenberg and Mr. Molther with teaching, that we ought to abstain from them." That *we?* No. That *unbelievers* ought. The assertion relates to them only.—" And the same you say in general of the Moravian brethren in your letter." I say, they hold that '*unbelievers* ought to abstain from them.' But yet I know and bear witness, they use them themselves, and that with reverence and godly fear? " 'Mr. Molther was quickly after recalled to Germany.'—This might be on other accounts. You do not say, it was out of any dislike of his doctrines or proceedings." I do not say so; because I am not sure; but I believe it was out of a dislike to *some* of his proceedings, if not, of his doctrines too. " Nor indeed can you, consistenly with your next words: 'The great fault of the Moravian church seems to lie, in not openly disclaiming all he had said' " (relating to this head.) They did *privately disclaim* what he had said, of degrees in faith. But I think, that was not enough. And I still believe, they would have done more, 'had they not leaned themselves to the same opinion,' touching the ordinances.

Thirdly, "You 'never knew but one of the Moravian church affirm, that a believer does not grow in holiness.' But who was this? No less a person than Count Zinzendorf, their great bishop and patron, whose authority is very high, all in all with them, and to whom you think they pay 'too much regard.'" Do you apprehend, where the stress of the argument lies? I never heard one Moravian affirm this, but the Count alone; and him only once; and that once was in the heat of dispute. And hence I inferred, it was not a doctrine of the Moravian church: nay, I doubt, whether it be the Count's own settled judgment.

3. But I may not dismiss this passage yet. It is now my turn to complain of unfair usage; of the exceeding lame, broken, imperfect manner wherein you cite my words. For instance; your citation runs thus: "You 'never knew but one of the Moravian church affirm, that a believer does not grow in holiness.'" Whereas my words are these, 'I never knew one of the Moravian church, but that single person, affirm, that a believer does not grow in holiness: and perhaps he would not affirm it on reflection.' Now why was the former part of the sentence changed, and the latter quite left out? Had the whole stood in your tract, just as it does in mine, it must have appeared, I do not here charge the Moravian church.

I complain also, of your manner of replying to the first article of this very paragraph. For you do not cite so much as one line of that answer, to which you profess to reply. My words are, 'You ought not to charge the Moravian church with the first of these (errors) since in the very page from which you quote those words, *There is no justifying faith, where there ever is any doubt*, that note occurs,* 'In the preface to the second Journal, the Moravian church is cleared from this mistake.' If you had cited these words, could you possibly have subjoined, "I have not charged the Moravian church with any thing; but only repeat after you!"

* Vol. II. p. 98.

4. I have now considered one page of your reply, in the manner you seem to require. But sure you cannot expect I should follow you thus, step by step, through a hundred and forty pages! If you should then think it worth while, to make a second reply, and to follow me in the same manner we might write indeed; but who would read?—I return therefore to what I proposed at first, viz. To touch only on what seems of the most importance, and to leave the rest just as it lies.

4. You say, (p. 80,) "With regard to subtlety, evasion, and disguise, you *now* would have it thought, that you only found this, 'in many of them; not in all, nor in most.'" "You *now* would have it thought!" Yes, and *always*, as well as *now*. For my original charge was, (Vol. II. p. 98.) 'I have found this, in many of you, i. e. much subtlety, much evasion, and disguise.' But you add, "Let the reader judge from the following passages, whether you did not charge the Moravians in general with these crimes. 'I had a long conference with those, whom I esteem very highly in love: but I could not yet understand them in one point, Christian openness and plainness of speech. They pleaded for such a reservedness and closeness of conversation. Yet I scarcely know what to think, considering they had the practice of the whole Moravian church on their side.'" True; in pleading for such a *reservedness* of conversation, as I could not in any ways approve of; but not in using much *subtlety*, *much evasion*, and *disguise:* this I dare not charge on the whole Moravian church. Those words also, 'There is darkness and closeness in all their behaviour, and guile in almost all their words,' I spoke, not of all the Moravians, nor of most: but of those who were then in England.' I could not speak it of them all; for I never found any guile in Christian David, Michael Linner, and many others.

5. "We are next to see, how you get over the objection I made good in three several particulars, that you have prepared the way for spreading of these tenets. The first you say nothing to here; the second you quote very partially

thus—'by countenancing and commending them.' And why would you not add, 'And being the occasion of so many of them coming over among us?'" Because I was not the occasion. I was indeed the first Englishman that ever was at Hernhuth. But before I was at Hernhuth, (I find on later inquiry,) the Count himself had been in England.

"You 'still think, (page 81,) That next to some thousands in our own Church, the body of the Moravian church, however mistaken some of them are, are in the main, the best Christians in the world.'" I do; 'of all whom I have seen;' (you should not omit these words.) "Those dreadful errors and crimes are here softened into mistakes." (I term them, 'Errors of judgment and practice.') "I have proved, that you have charged the body with such." At present, the proof does not amount to demonstration. There needs a little farther proof, that I charge any "*dreadful crimes* on the *body* of the Moravians."

I see no manner of inconsistency still, in those accounts of my intercourse with the Moravians, which you suppose irreconcilable with each other. Let any one read them in the Journal, and judge.

6. "You had said, 'Your objections then were nearly the same as now.' You now add, 'only with this difference: I was not then assured, that the facts were as I supposed; I did not dare to determine any thing.' No! Not when by conversing among them you *saw* these things! As indeed the facts are of such a nature, that you could not but be assured of them, if they were true. Nor do the questions in your letter really imply any doubt of their truth: but are so many appeals to their consciences, and equivalent to strong assertions. And if you had not been assured, if you did not dare to determine any thing concerning what you saw, your writing bare suspicions to a body of men in such a manner was inexcusable. This excuse therefore will not serve you," p. 83.

I apprehend it will. 'I was not then (in September, 1738,) assured that the facts were as I supposed. [These,

fore] I did not [then] dare to determine any thing.' Be pleased to add the immediately following words: 'But from November 1, [1739,] I saw more and more things, which I could not reconcile with the gospel.'

If you had not omitted these words, you could have had no colour to remark, on my saying, 'I did not dare to determine any thing.' "No! Not when by conversing among them, you *saw* these things." No, I did not *dare to determine*, in September, 1738, from what I saw in November, 1739. "But the facts are of such a nature, that you could not but be assured of them, if they were true." I cannot think so. 'Is not the Count all in all among you? Do not you magnify your own church too much? Do you not use guile and dissimulation in many cases?' These facts are by no means of such a nature, as that whoever converses (even intimately) among the Moravians cannot but be assured of them. "Nor do the questions in your Letter really imply any doubt of their truth." No! Are not my very words prefixed to those questions, 'Of some other things I stand in doubt. And I wish, "in order to remove those *doubts*," you would—plainly answer, whether the fact be as I suppose. "But [these questions] are so many appeals to their consciences." True. "And equivalent to strong assertions." Utterly false. "If you had not been assured, if you did not dare to determine any thing, concerning what you saw [fifteen months after] your writing bare suspicions to a body of men, in such a manner, was inexcusable." They were "strong presumptions" then; which yet I did not "write to a body of men," whom I so highly esteemed; no, not even in the *tenderest* manner, till I was *assured*, they were not groundless.

7. "In a note at the bottom of p. 8, you observe, 'The Band Society in London began May 1, some time before I set out for Germany.' Would you insinuate here, that you did not set it up, in imitation of the Moravians?" Sir, I will tell you the naked truth. You had remarked (p. 17,) thus—"You took the trouble of a journey to Germany to them; and were so much in love with their methods, that,

at *your return* hither, you set up their bands among your disciples." This was an entire mistake: for that society was set up, not only before I returned, but before I set out. And I designed that note to insinuate this to you, without telling your mistake to all the world.

"I imagined, that supposing your account of the Moravians true, it would be impossible for any serious Christian to doubt of their being very wicked people." I know many serious Christians who suppose it true, and yet believe they are, in the main, good men. "A much worse character, take the whole body together, cannot be given of a body of men." Let us try. 'Here is a body of men who have not one spark either of justice, mercy, or truth, among them; who are lost to all sense of right and wrong; who have neither sobriety, temperance, nor chastity: who are, in general, liars, drunkards, gluttons, thieves, adulterers, murderers.' I cannot but think, that this is a much worse character than that of the Moravians, take it how you will. "Let the reader judge how far you are now able to defend them." Just as far as I did at first. Still I dare not condemn what is good among them; and I will not excuse what is evil.

8. "'The Moravians excel in sweetness of behaviour.'" "What, though they use guile and dissimulation?" Yes. "'Where is their multitude of errors?'" "In your own Journal. I have taken the pains to place them in one view in my Remarks; the justness of which, with all your art, you cannot disprove." You have taken the pains to transcribe many words; all which together amount to this, that they (generally) hold Universal Salvation, and are partly Antinomians, (in opinion) partly Quietists. The justness of some of your remarks, if I mistake not, have been pretty fully disproved. As to what you speak of my art, subtlety, and so on, in this and many other places, I look upon it as neither better nor worse than a civil way of calling names.

"'To this multitude of crimes * I am also an utter

* Second Letter, p. 84.

stranger.'" "Then you have charged them wrongfully.—What do you account guile," &c.? I account guile, despising self-denial, even in the smallest points, and teaching that those who have not the assurance of faith, may not use the ordinances of God, the Lord's Supper in particular, (this is the real, unaggravated charge,) to be faults which cannot be excused. But I do not account them altogether "a multitude of crimes." I conceive this is a vehement hyperbole.

"The honour of religion," said you, and "virtue trampled upon?" I answered, 'By whom? Not by the Moravians.' You reply, "And yet you have accused some of these as decrying all the means of grace." No. What I accused them of was, teaching that an unbeliever (in their sense) ought to abstain from them. 'Neither did I know, or think, or say, they were desperately wicked people.' "Your Journal is before the world; to whom I appeal whether this has not so represented them." But how do you here represent your remark, and my answer? My paragraph runs thus, p. 10.

'You go on—"How could you so long and so intimately converse with—such desperately wicked people as the Moravians, according to your own account, were known by you to be?" O Sir, what another assertion is this! "The Moravians, according to your own account, were known by you to be desperately wicked people, while you intimately conversed with them." Utterly false and injurious! I never gave any such account. I conversed with them intimately both at Savannah and Hernhuth. But neither then, nor at any other time, did I *know*, or think, or say, they were desperately wicked people. I think and say—just the reverse, viz. That though I soon found among them a few things which I could not approve, yet I believe they are, in the main, some of the best Christians in the world.' After this, are *you* the person, who complains of *me*, for imperfect and partial quotations?

I added, 'You surprise me yet more in going on thus—"In God's name, Sir, is the contempt of almost the whole

of our duty, of every Christian ordinance, to be so very gently touched?" Sir, this is not the case. This charge no more belongs to the Moravians than that of murder,' p. 11.

You reply, "Mr. Sp. and Mr. Molther, are accused by name. If falsely, I am sorry both for them and you." Accused? True. But of what? Of the contempt of every Christian ordinance, of almost the whole of our duty? By no means. The plain case is, I accuse them of one thing, viz. 'Teaching that an unbeliever should abstain from the ordinances.' You accuse them of another, "contemning every Christian ordinance, and almost the whole of our duty." And this you would father upon me. I desire to be excused.

9. As to what I said in my letter to the Moravian church, 'You can hinder this if you will. Therefore if you do not prevent their speaking thus, you do in effect speak thus yourselves.' It may be observed, 1. That this letter is dated, August 8, 1741. 2. That from that time the Moravian church did in great measure prevent any of their members speaking thus.

You proceed. "You distinguish between the English brethren and the Moravians. These English brethren, I presume, were your followers. Afterwards you represent them as perverted by the Moravians. Before they had spoken these wicked things, you say, they had joined these men, and acted under their direction. If they did not learn them from these new teachers, from whom did they learn them? Not sure from yourself, or any other Methodists. You cannot therefore bring off the Moravians, without condemning your own people. Here therefore you have certainly overshot yourself," (p. 85.) Perhaps not. "These English brethren were, I presume, your followers." No; this is your first mistake. I was but a single private member of that society. "Afterwards you represent them as perverted by the Moravians." I do; but not yet connected with them. "Before they spoke these wicked things, they had joined these men, and acted under their direction."

This is another mistake. They did not join these men, nor act by their direction, till long after. "If they did not learn them from these new teachers, from whom did they learn them? You cannot bring off the Moravians, without condemning your own people." They learned them from Mr. Molther chiefly; whom I am not at all concerned to bring off. Now let all men judge, which of us two has overshot himself!

10. "In answer to my objections against the inconsistent accounts you had given of the Moravians, you say, 'They are, I believe, the most self-inconsistent people under the sun.' Would not one imagine, that you here speak of the same persons, or of the whole body of them in general?" I do, thus far: I ascribe the good to the body of them in general; the evil to part only of that body, to *some* of those "same persons."

"Your method of getting over the contradictions I had charged upon you is much the same, (p. 86.) To distinguish either between the Moravians and the English brethren, (though these had been their disciples.") This has been abundantly answered. "Or between some of the Moravians and others." I think a very good method; for propositions are not contradictory, unless they both speak of the same persons.

However, since you persist to affirm, that I am "guilty of the contradictions you charged upon me," (p. 87,) I think there cannot be a sufficient reply, without reciting the several instances.

11. First, "You commend them (the Moravians) for loving one another; and yet charge them with biting and devouring one another." I answered, 'Them! Whom? Not the Moravians, but the English brethren of Fetter-lane, before their union with the Moravians. Herein then is no shadow of contradiction. For the two sentences do not relate to the same persons.

You reply, "Would you then have us to think, that so much anger and contradiction reigned among your Methodists?" I would have you think, this is nothing to the pur-

pose. Prove the contradiction, and you speak to the point. "It is plain they had before this been perverted by the Moravians, and that—they were unwilling to be taught by any others."—*They*—that is, nearly half of the society. But here is no proof of the contradiction still.

2. "You say, 'They had well nigh destroyed brotherly-love among us, partly by cautions against natural love.'" [Partly by occasioning almost continual disquiet.] So they had. But we had then no connexion with them. Neither therefore does this contradict their loving one another. You reply, "As if they can truly love each other, who teach you not to do it, and stir up divisions and disturbances among you." You should say, if you would repeat after me, 'Who caution you against natural love, and occasion many disputes among you.' Well; allowing they do this, (which is utterly wrong) yet where is the contradiction? Yet they may love one another.

3. "You 'praise them for using no diversions, but such as become saints: and yet say' (I recite the whole sentence) 'I have heard some of you affirm, that Christian salvation implies liberty to conform to the world, by joining in worldly diversions, in order to do good.'" And both these are true. The Moravians, in general, 'use no diversions but such as become saints.' And yet I have heard some of them affirm, (in contradiction to their own practice,) that 'one then mentioned did well, when he joined in playing at tennis, in order to do good.' To this you make no reply. Silence then consents, that there is no contradiction here.

4. "You 'praise them for not regarding outward adorning.'" So I do, the bulk of the congregation. "And yet you say, (I again recite the whole sentence) 'I have heard some of you affirm, that Christian salvation implies liberty to conform to the world, by putting on gold and costly apparel.'" I have so. And I blame them the more, because they are condemned by the general practice of their own church. To this also you reply not. So I must count this the fourth contradiction which you have charged upon me, but have not proved.

5. "You call their discipline, *in most respects*, truly excellent. I could wish you had more fully explained yourself." I have in the 2d Journal, from the 44th to the 88th page.—"It is no sign of good discipline, to permit such abominations," (i. e. error in opinion, and guile in practice.) 'True; it is not; nor is it any demonstration against it. For there may be good discipline, even in a college of Jesuits. Another fault is, too great deference to the Count. And yet, in most respects, their discipline is truly excellent.'

You reply, "Such excellent discipline, for all that I know, they may have, [i. e. as the Jesuits;] but I cannot agree—that this is scarcely inferior to that of the apostolical age." It may be, for any thing you advance to the contrary. "Here I cited some words of yours, condemning their subordination, (p. 88,) which you prudently take no notice of." Yes; I had just before taken notice of their too great deference to the Count. But, the contradicion! Where is the contradiction?

6. "You mention it as a good effect of their discipline, that every one knows and keeps his proper rank. Soon after, as it were with a design to confute yourself, you say, 'Our brethren have neither wisdom enough to guide, nor prudence enough to let it alone.'" I answered, 'Pardon me, Sir, I have no design either to confute or contradict myself in these words. The former sentence is spoken of the Moravian brethren. The latter of the English brethren of Fetter-lane, (not then united with the Moravians, neither acting by their direction.)' To this likewise you do not reply. Here is then a sixth contradiction, alleged against me, but not proved.

12. However you add, "Had you—shewn me mistaken in any point you have attempted to reply to, still—you confess errors and wickedness enough among the Moravians, to render your account of them very inconsistent. But you have not succeeded in any one answer. You have not shewn, that I have in any one instance misquoted you, or misunderstood the character you had given of them, or

argued falsely from what you had said of them. And truly, Sir, all you have done, has been cavilling at a few particulars. But the argument I was urging all this while you quite forgot."

Sir, if it be so, you do me too much honour, in setting pen to paper again. But is it so? Have I "all this while quite forgot the argument you were urging?" I hope not. I seem to remember, you "were urging" some argument, (Remarks, p. 21,) to prove, that I "fall not only into inconsistencies, but direct contradictions;" and that I shewed you *mistaken* not only in *one*, but in *every* point which you advanced as such: that I did not confess any such *errors* or *wickedness* of the Moravians, as rendered my account of them *self-inconsistent:* that I *succeeded* in more than *one* answer, to the objections you had urged against it; and that I *shewed*, you had "misquoted or misunderstood the character I had given of them, or argued falsely from it," not properly "in one instance," but from the beginning to the end. Yet this I think it incumbent upon me to say, that whereinsoever I have contributed, directly or indirectly, to the spreading of any thing evil, which is, or has been, among the Moravians, I am sorry for it, and hereby ask pardon, both of God and all the world.

II. 1. I think it appears, by what you yourself observed, that on the second head, justification by faith, I allow, in the beginning of the *Farther Appeal*, almost as much as you contend for. I desire leave to cite part of that passage again, that we may come as near each other as possible. I would just subjoin a few words on each head, which I hope may remove more difficulties out of the way.

'That justification whereof our Articles and Homilies speak, means present pardon, and acceptance with God: who therein *declares his righteousness* or *mercy*, *by* or *for the remission of sins that are past*.' I say, *past*. For I cannot find any thing in the Bible, of the remission of sins, past, present, and to come.

'I believe the condition of this is faith: I mean not only, that without faith we cannot be justified, but also, that as

soon as any one has true faith, in that moment he is justified.' You take the word Condition in the former sense only, as that without which we cannot be justified. In this sense of the word, I think we may allow, that there are several conditions of justification.

'Good works follow this faith, but cannot go before it. Much less can sanctification; which implies a continued course of good works, springing from holiness of heart.' Yet such a course is, without doubt, absolutely necessary to our continuance in a State of Justification.

'It is allowed, that repentance and *fruits meet for repentance*, go before faith. Repentance absolutely must go before faith: fruits meet for it, if there be opportunity. By Repentance I mean conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment: and by *fruits meet for repentance*, forgiving our brother, ceasing from evil, doing good, using the ordinances of God, and, in general, obeying him according to the measure of grace which we have received. But these I cannot as yet term good works, because they do not spring from faith and the love of God.' Although the same works are then good, when they are performed by those who have believed.

'Faith in general is, a divine, supernatural ελεγχος, (*evidence*, or *conviction*) of things not seen, not discoverable by our bodily senses, as being either past, future, or spiritual. Justifying faith implies, not only a divine ελεγχος, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, but a sure trust and confidence, that Christ died for *my* sins, that he loved *me*, and gave himself for *me*. And the moment a *penitent* sinner *thus* believes, God pardons and absolves him.' I say, a *penitent* sinner; because justifying faith cannot exist without previous repentance.

——'Yet although both repentance, and the fruits thereof, are in *some sense* necessary before justification, neither the one nor the other is necessary in the *same sense*, or in the *same degree* with faith. Not in the same degree. For in whatever moment a man believes, (in the Christian sense of the word,) he is justified. But it is not so, at whatever

moment he repents, or brings forth any, or all the fruits of repentance.—Consequently, none of these are necessary to justification, in the same degree with faith.'

'Nor in the same sense. For none of these has so direct, immediate a relation to justification as faith. This is *proximately* necessary thereto; repentance *remotely*, as it is necessary to faith (so the error of the press is to be corrected.) And the fruits of repentance still *more remotely*, as they are necessary to the increase, or continuance of repentance. And even in this sense, they are only necessary on supposition—if there be time and opportunity for them. For in many instances there is not, but God cuts short his work, and faith prevents the fruits of repentance.'

2. Thus far I believe we are nearly agreed. But on those words, 'Far other qualifications are required, in order to our standing before God in glory, than were required in order to his giving us faith and pardon: in order to this, nothing is *indispensably* required, but repentance or conviction of sin; but in order to the other, it is *indispensably* required, that we be fully cleansed from all sin:' you remark, "Here, I apprehend, are two great mistakes, 1. You make too little necessary before pardon. 2. Too much afterward. You confine repentance within too narrow limits, and extend holiness beyond its just bounds, (p. 92.) First, By repentance you mean only conviction of sin. But this is a very partial account of it. Every child that has learned his catechism can tell, that forsaking of sin is also included in it.—Living in obedience to God's will, when there is opportunity; and even when there is not, a sincere desire and purpose to do so—and a faith in God's mercies through Christ Jesus."

I had said, 'In order to God's giving us faith and pardon, nothing is indispensably required but repentance,' i. e. 'Conviction of sin, producing real desires and sincere resolutions of amendment.' But you "apprehend, that I am here in a great mistake:" that I give a "very partial account of repentance:" that I ought to "include therein a sincere desire and purpose to obey God." I do: I have

said so expressly. And "living in obedience to God's will, when there is opportunity." Very well; but I here speak of what is *indispensably required*, i. e. whether there is opportunity of actual obedience or not. "And a faith in God's mercies through Christ Jesus." A very great mistake indeed! My not including faith in that *repentance*, which I say is *indispensably* required—*in order* to faith!

"Secondly, You make sinless perfection necessary after justification, in order to make us meet for glory." And who does not? Indeed men do not agree in the time. Some believe it is attained before death: some, in the article of death: some, in an after-state; in the *mystic*, or the *popish* purgatory. But all writers whom I have ever seen till now (the Romish themselves not excepted) agree, that we must be *fully cleansed from all sin*, before we can enter into glory.

3. After what has already been allowed, I cannot think it needful to dispute farther on the head of justification. Rather suffer me to close this part of our debate, by transcribing what I assent to, from that clear recapitulation of your sentiments, which you have given in your 45th and 46th pages.

'First, Justification is the act of God, pardoning our sins, and receiving us again to his favour. This was free in him, because undeserved by us; undeserved, because we had transgressed his law, and could not, nor even can now, perfectly fulfil it.'

2. 'We cannot therefore be justified by our works, because this would be, to be justified by some merit of our own. Much less can we be justified by an external show of religion, or by any superstitious observances.

3. 'The life and death of our Lord is the sole meritorious cause of this mercy, which must be firmly believed and trusted in by us. Our faith therefore in him, though not more meritorious than any other of our actions, yet has a nearer relation to the promises of pardon through him, and is the mean and instrument whereby we embrace and receive them.'

4. 'True faith must be lively and productive of good works, which are its proper fruits, the marks whereby it is known.'

5. 'Works really good, are such as are commanded by God (springing from faith) done by the aid of his Holy Spirit, with good designs, and to good ends. These may be considered as internal or external.'

6. 'The inward ones, such as hope, trust, fear, and love of God and our neighbour, (which may be more properly termed *good dispositions*, and [are branches of] sanctification) must always be joined with faith, and consequently be *conditions present* in justification, though they are not the means or instruments of receiving it.'

7. 'The outward'—(which are more properly termed good works,) 'though there be no immediate opportunity of practising them, and therefore a sincere desire and resolution to perform them, be sufficient for the present; yet must follow after as soon as occasion offers, and will then be necessary conditions of preserving our justification.'

8. 'There is a justification conveyed to us in our baptism, or properly, this state is then begun. But—should we fall into sins—we cannot regain it without true faith and repentance, which implies (as its fruits) a forsaking of our sins, and amendment of (our whole) life.'

I have only one circumstance farther to add, namely, That I am not *newly* convinced of these things. For this is the doctrine which I have continually taught for eight or nine years last past: only, I abstained from the word *condition*, perhaps more scrupulously than was needful.

4. With regard to the *consequences* of my teaching this doctrine, I desire any who will not account it lost labour, to consult with his own eyes, seriously and in the fear of God, the 3d and 4th Journals. And if he pleases, he may farther read over and compare, from the 25th to the 29th page of my answer, with your reply, from the 101st (inclusive) to the 104th page.

Among the consequences you reckoned (in your Remarks) besides "introducing predestination, confusion, presumption, and despair, many very shocking instances of all

which (your words are) you give us among your followers," p. 52, 55; I answered, 'You should have specified a few of those instances; at least the pages where they occur.' (Suppose, only three of each sort, out of any, or all the four Journals.) 'Till this is done, I can look upon this assertion as no other than the flourish of your pen.'

Upon this you exclaim, (p. 111,) "I must beg the reader to observe your method of citing my words. Many instances of omissions he has had already. But here is such a one, as I believe few controversies can parallel. Would not any one imagine from the view of these words, Predestination, confusion, presumption, and despair, that they occurred all together in page 52, of my Remarks, and that I observed nothing farther concerning this point? Could it be thought, that any thing intervened between the page referred to, and the last sentence? And yet so it is, that near three pages intervene!" Ha! do "near three pages intervene!" Prodigious indeed! "And this is called an answer!" So it is, for want of a better.

"Your businesss was to shew, that the Calvinistical notions have not prevailed among the Methodists, or that they were no consequences of unconditional justification." No, Sir, it was not my business to shew this. It was not my business to prove the negative, but yours, to prove the affirmative. Mr. Whitefield is himself a Calvinist. Such therefore, doubtless, are many of his followers. But Calvinism has not prevailed at all among the Methodists, (so called,) nor is it to this day any consequence of unconditional justification, in the manner wherein I preach it.

5. You next "take the pains to lay before the reader, an instance or two of confusion," &c. The first I read thus: p. 11.

"While we were at the room, Mrs. J. sitting at home, took the Bible to read. But on a sudden, threw it away, saying, I am good enough. I will never read or pray more. She was in the same mind when I came; often repeating, I used to think, I was full of sin, and that I sinned in every thing I did. But now I know better. I am a good Christian. I never did any harm in my life. I do not desire to be any

better than I am; she spake many things to the same effect, plainly shewing, that the spirit of pride and of lies had the full dominion over her. I asked, Do you desire to be healed? She said, I am whole. But do you desire to be saved? She replied, I am saved, I ail nothing, I am happy. This is one of the fruits of the present salvation and sinless perfection, taught by you among the weak and ignorant."

I should wonder if the scarecrow of *sinless perfection* were not brought in some way or other. But to the point. You here repeat a relation as from me, and that in *confirmation*, you say, of your own veracity, and yet leave out both the beginning of that relation, part of the middle, and the end of it.

I begin thus, (Vol. II. p. 61,) 'Sund. Jan. 11, I met with a surprising instance of the power of the devil.' These words, of all others, should not have been left out, being a key to all that follows. In the middle of the relation, immediately after the words, 'I am happy,' I add, 'Yet it was easy to discern, she was in the most violent agony both of body and mind, sweating exceedingly, notwithstanding the severest frost, and not continuing in the same posture a moment.' A plain proof, that this was no instance of *presumption*, nor a *natural* fruit of any teaching whatever.

It ends thus. 'About a quarter before six the next morning, after lying quiet for a while, she broke out, 'Peace be unto thee, (her husband,) peace be unto this house, the peace of God is come to my soul! I know that my Redeemer liveth.' And for several days her mouth was filled with his praise, and her talk was wholly of his wondrous works.' Had not these words been left out, neither could this have passed for an instance of *despair*. Though still I do not know but it might have stood for an instance of *confusion*, &c.

I must not forget, that this was cited at first, as a proof of my *enthusiasm:* as an instance of "a private revelation, which (you say) I seem to pay great credit to —representing the conjectures of a woman—whose brain appears to have been too much heated, as if they had been owing to a particular and miraculous spirit of prophecy,"

(Remarks, p. 64.) I answered, 'Descant, Sir, as you please on this *enthusiasm;* on the *credit* paid to this *private revelation;* and my representing the *conjectures* of this brain-sick woman, as owing to a miraculous power of the *spirit of prophecy.* And when you have done, I will desire you to read the passage once more; where you will find my express words are, (introducing this account.) 'Sunday 11, I met with a surprising instance of the *power of the devil.*' Such was the credit I paid to this revelation! All which I ascribe to the Spirit of God is, the enabling her to strive against the power of the devil, and at length restoring peace to her soul.' Answer, p. 41.

I was in hopes you had done with this instance. But I am disappointed. For in your 2d letter I read thus, (p. 130,) "'The instances of enthusiasm and presumption, which your last Journal had furnished me with, remain now to be reviewed. The first was of a private revelation, which you appeared to pay great credit to. You had represented every thing the woman had spoken in her agony as coming to pass." But I had not represented any thing she spoke then, whether it came to pass or not, as coming "from the *Spirit of God,*" but from the *devil.*

You say, "When I read this first, I was amazed, and—impatient to look again into your Journal. But I had no sooner done this, but I was still more astonished. For you have very grievously misrepresented the case." If I have, then I will bear the blame; but if not, it will light on *your* head.

"It is not *this* account which you had thus introduced; but another, and a very different one, of what happened a day or two before. Sunday, you mention her as being guilty of gross presumption, which you attribute to the power of the devil. But on Monday and Tuesday the opposite revelations happened, which—you relate without the least mark of diffidence or blame," p. 131.

I am grieved, that you constrain me to say any more. In the 4th Journal, Vol. II. p. 61, I gave an account of Mrs. Jones, which I term, 'a surprising instance of the power of the devil.' It includes the occurrences of three days. This

you brought as a proof of my enthusiasm. I answer, 'The very words that introduce *this account*,' prove it is no instance of enthusiasm: meaning by *this account* (as I suppose is plain to every reader) the following account of Mrs. Jones. You reply, "It is not *this* account which you had thus introduced, but another, and a very different one, of what happened a day or two before." Sir, it is the whole account of Mrs. Jones which I thus introduce; and not another; not a very different one. And I attribute the agony which she (Mrs. Jones) was in, and most of the words which she spoke, both on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, not to the Spirit of God, but to the power of the devil.

6. The next instance, which you relate as an instance of despair, is that of a young woman of Kingswood; which you break off with, "Take me away," &c. (p. 112.) But why did you not decypher that, &c. Why did you not add the rest of the paragraph? Because it would have spoiled your whole argument. It would have shewn what the end of the Lord was, in permitting that severe visitation. The words are, (Journ. 3, Vol. I. p. 424,) 'We interrupted her by calling again upon God, on which she sunk down as before, (as one asleep,) and another young woman began to roar as loud as she had done. My brother now came in, it being about nine o'clock. We continued in prayer till past eleven: when God in a moment spoke peace into the soul, first, of the first tormented, and then of the other. And they both joined in singing praises to him, who had stilled the enemy and the avenger.'

7. I am sorry to find you still affirm, that with regard to the Lord's Supper also, I "advance many injudicious, false, and dangerous things. Such as, 1. "That a man ought to communicate, without a sure trust in God's mercy through Christ, (p. 117.)" You make these as my words; but I know them not. 2. "That there is no previous preparation indispensably necessary, but a desire to receive whatsoever God pleases to give." But I include abundantly more in that desire, than you seem to apprehend; even a willingness to know and to do the will of God. 3. "That

no fitness is required at the time of communicating," (I recite the whole sentence,) "but a sense of our state, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness! Every one who knows he is fit for hell, being just fit to come to Christ, in this, as well as in all other ways of his appointment." But neither can this sense of our utter sinfulness and helplessness subsist, without earnest desires of universal holiness. "There was another passage," you say, "which you chose to omit," (p. 118.) Which this was, I do not understand. Nor do I perceive any one of those dreadful positions (as you style them) to be contrary to the word of God.

8. You will likewise, at all hazards, stand your ground, as to the charge of *stoical insensibility*. I answered before, (p. 36,) 'How do you support the charge? Why thus,—"You say, the servants of God suffer nothing." And can you possibly misunderstand these words, if you read those that immediately follow? His body was well nigh torn asunder with pain. But God made all his bed in his sickness. So that he was continually giving thanks to God, and making his boast of his praise.'

You reply, (118,) "If you meant no more than that a man under the sharpest pains, may be thankful to God, why did you call this a strange truth?"—Because I think it is so. I think it exceeding strange, that one in such a degree of pain, should be continually giving thanks to God. Not that I suppose him *insensible of his torments*. 'His body, I say, was well nigh torn asunder with pain.' But the love of God so abundantly overbalanced all pain, that it was nothing to him.

"The next instance is as follows. One told you, Sir, I thought last week there could be no such rest as you describe; none in this world wherein we should be so free, as not desire ease in pain. But God has taught me better. For on Friday and Saturday, when I was in the strongest pain, I never once had one moment's desire of ease" (add, 'but only that the Will of God might be done.')

Neither has this any resemblance of *stoical insensibility*. I never *supposed*, that this person did not *feel* pain: (nor

indeed that there is any state on earth, wherein we shall not feel it.) But that her soul was filled with the love of God, and thankfully resigned to his Will.

"Another instance is taken from one of your hymns, where are these lines: (p. 119.)

"Doom, if thou canst, to endless pains,
And drive me from thy face:" (Add,
'But if thy stronger love constrains,
Let me sav'd by grace.')

"This I thought the height of insensibility, extravagance, and presumption.—You see nothing of these in it. And yet you explain yourself thus, 'If thou canst deny thyself, if thou canst forget to be gracious, if thou canst cease to be truth and love.' All which, in my opinion, is fixing the charge more strongly upon you. For the supposition that Christ *can* do these things"—Are you in earnest, Sir? Are you really ignorant, that expressions of this kind, do not suppose he *can*, but quite the reverse? That they are one of the strongest forms of obtestation, of adjuring God to shew mercy, by all his grace, and truth, and love? So far is this also from proving the charge of stoical insensibility.

III. 1. I come now to consider the point of church-communion, of which you have spoken in the beginning of your treatise. In the entrance you say, "We teach no other doctrine than has always been taught in our church.—Our sentiments concerning justification are reconcileable to our articles, homilies, and service. This I apprehend several of the Methodists have been convinced of, and have *therefore* left our communion entirely. You give us more instances than one of this in your last Journal."—(p. 2.) No, not one. Nor did I ever yet know one man, who "therefore left the communion of the church," because he was convinced that either her articles, homilies, or liturgy opposed his sentiments concerning justification. Poor Mr. St. and Mr. Simpson were induced to leave it, by reasons of quite another kind.

You add, "We cannot wonder, that some Methodists,

have withdrawn from her, while they have been used to hear doctrines, which they must have been sensible, have no place in her articles and service." So far from it, that all I know of them are deeply *sensible*, the *doctrines they have been used to hear* daily, are no other than the genuine doctrines of the church, as expressed both in her articles and service.

2. But our present question turns not on doctrine but discipline. "My first business" (you say) "is to consider, some very lax notions of church-communion, which I find in your last Journal, (Vol. II. p. 23.) You say, 'Our 19th article defines a true church, a congregation of faithful people, wherein the true word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered,'" (p. 3.) The use I would willingly make of this definition, (which, observe, is not mine, be it good or bad,) is to stop the boasting of ungodly men, by cutting off their pretence to call themselves *of the church*. But you think, they may call themselves so still. Then let them. I will not contend about it.

But you cannot infer from hence, that my notions of church communion are either lax or otherwise. The definition which I occasionally cite, shews nothing of my sentiments on that head. And for any thing which occurs in this page, they may be strict or loose, right or wrong.

You add, "It will be requisite, (p. 5,) in order to approve yourself a minister of our church, that you follow her rules and orders.—That you constantly conform to the method of worship she has prescribed, and study to promote her peace."—All this is good and fit to be done. But it properly belongs to the following question.—"What led you into such loose notions of church-communion, I imagine, might be, your being conscious to yourself, that according to the strict, just account of the Church of England, you could not, with any grace, maintain your pretensions to belong still to her."—Sir, I have never told you yet, what my notions of the church-communion are. They may be wrong, or they may be right, for all you know. Therefore, when you are first supposing that I have told

you my notions, and then assigning the reasons of them, what can be said, but that you imagine the whole matter?

3. How far I have *acted agreeably to the rules and orders* of our church, is a farther question. You think I have acted contrary thereto, first, By using *extemporary prayer* in public. "The church," you say, "has strongly declared her mind on this point, by appointing her excellent liturgy, which you have solemnly promised to use—and no other." I know not when or where.—"And whoever does not worship God in the manner she prescribes, must be supposed to slight and contemn her offices and rules: and, therefore, can be no more worthy to be called her minister," (p. 7.)

I do not *slight or contemn the offices* of the church. I esteem them very highly. And yet I do not, at all times, worship God, even in public, in the very terms of those offices. Nor yet do I knowingly *slight or contemn her rules*. For it is not clear to my apprehension, that she has any rule which forbids using extemporary prayer, suppose between the morning and evening service. And if I am *not worthy to be called her minister*, (which I dare by no means affirm myself to be,) yet *her minister I am*, and must always be, unless I should be judicially deposed from my ministry.

Your second argument is this: "If you suppose the Scripture enjoins you to use extemporary prayer, then you must suppose our liturgy to be inconsistent with Scripture, and, consequently, unlawful to be used." That does not follow: unless I supposed the Scripture to enjoin, to use extemporary prayer, *and no other*. Then it would follow, that a form of prayer was inconsistent with Scripture. But this I never did suppose.

Your third argument is to this effect: "You act contrary to the rule of the church. Allow she is in the wrong: yet while you break her rule, how do you act as her minister?" It ought to be expressed; "How are you her minister?" For the conclusion to be proved is, That I am not her minister. I answer, 1. I am not convinced, as I observed before, that I do hereby *break her rule*. 2. If I did, yet should I not *cease* to be her minister, unless I were formally

depriced. 3. I now *actually do* continue in her communion, and hope that I always shall.

4. You object farther, "That I disobey the governors of the church." I answer, I both do, and will obey them in all things, where I do not apprehend there is some particular Law of God to the contrary. "Here," you say, "you confess that in some things you do not, and cannot obey your governors," (p. 8.)—Did I *confess this?* Then I spoke rashly and foolishly: for I granted more than I can make good. I do certainly apprehend that the Law of God requires me, both to preach and (sometimes) to pray *extempore.* Yet I do not know that I disobey the governors of the church herein. For I do not know, that they have forbidden me to do either.

"But your behaviour and method of teaching is irregular. Have you any warrant from Scripture for preaching" up and down thus?—I think I have: I think God hath called me to this work 'by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery,' which directs me how to obey that general command, 'While we have time, let us do good unto all men.'

"But we ought to do this agreeably to our respective situations, and not break in upon each other's provinces. Every private man may take upon himself the office of a magistrate—and quote this text as justly as you have done," (p. 9.) No. The private man is not called to the office of a *magistrate;* but I am to the office of a *preacher.* "You were indeed authorized to preach the gospel: but it was in the congregation to which you should be lawfully appointed.—Whereas you have many years preached in places whereunto you were not lawfully appointed; nay, which were intrusted to others, who neither wanted nor desired your assistance." Many of them wanted it enough, whether they desired it or not. But I shall not now debate that point. I rather follow you to the first of the *Farther Appeal,* where this objection is considered.

5. "Our church," (it was said) "has provided against this preaching up and down, in the ordination of a priest,

by *expressly limiting* the exercise of the powers then conferred upon him, to the *congregation* where he shall be lawfully appointed thereunto." I answered, 1. 'Your argument proves too much. If it be allowed just as you propose it, it proves, that no priest has authority either to preach or administer the sacrament in any other than his own congregation.' *Farther Appeal*, p. 84.

You reply, "Is there no difference between a thing's being done occasionally—and its being done for years together?"—Yes, a great one. And more inconveniences may arise from the latter than from the former. But this is all wide: it does not touch the point. Still if our church does *expressly limit* the exercise of the sacerdotal powers, to *that congregation* whereunto each priest shall be appointed; this precludes him from exercising those powers *at all*, in any other than *that congregation*. I answered, 2. 'Had the powers conferred been so *limited* when I was ordained priest, my ordination would have signified just nothing. For I was not *appointed to any congregation* at all: but was ordained as a member of that "college of divines," (so our statutes express it) "founded to overturn all heresies, and defend the catholic faith."'

You reply, "I presume it was expected you should either continue at your college, or enter upon some regular cure." Perhaps so; but I must still insist, that if my sacerdotal powers had been then *expressly limited to that congregation* whereunto I should be *appointed*, my ordination would have *signified nothing*. I mean, I could never, in virtue of that ordination, have exercised those powers at all: seeing I never was appointed to any single congregation; at least, not till I went to Georgia.

I answered, 3. 'For many years after I was ordained priest, this limitation was never heard of. I heard not one syllable of it, by way of objection to my preaching up and down, in Oxford or London, or the parts adjacent: in Gloucestershire or Worcestershire: in Lancashire, Yorkshire, or Lincolnshire. Nor did the strictest disciplinarian

scruple suffering me to exercise those powers wherever I came.'

You reply, "There is great difference between preaching occasionally—with the leave of the incumbent, and doing it constantly without their leave." I grant there is; and there are objections to the latter, which do not reach the former case. But they do not belong to this head. They do not in the least affect this consequence, "If every priest, when ordained, is *expressly limited*, touching the exercise of the power then received, to *that congregation* to which he shall be appointed; then is he precluded by this *express limitation*, from preaching, with or without the incumbent's leave, in *any other congregation* whatever."

I answered, 4. 'Is it not, in fact, universally allowed, that every priest, as such, has a power, in virtue of his ordination, to preach—in any congregation, where the curate desires his assistance?'

You reply to this by what you judge a parallel case. But it does not touch the *restriction* in question. Either this does, or does not *expressly limit* the exercise of the powers conferred upon a priest in his ordination, to *that congregation* whereunto he shall be appointed. If it does not, I am not condemned by this; however faulty I may be on a thousand other accounts. If it does, then is every priest condemned who ever preaches out of the *congregation to which he is appointed.*

Your parallel case is this—"Because a man does not offend against the law of the land, when I prevail upon him to teach my children.—Therefore he is empowered to seize" [read, he does not offend against the law of the land in seizing] "an apartment in my house, and against my will and approbation to continue therein, and to direct and dictate to my family!" (p. 11.)

An exact parallel indeed!—When therefore I came to live in St. Luke's parish, was it just the same thing as if I had "seized an apartment in Dr. Buckley's house?" And was the "continuing therein against his will and approba-

tion" (supposing it were so) precisely the same, as if I had continued *in his house*, whether he would or not? Is the one exactly the same "offence against the law of the land" as the other? Once more. Is the warning *sinners* in Moorfields, to flee from the wrath to come, the very same with directing the Dr.'s *family under his own roof?*—I should not have answered this, but that I was afraid you would conclude it was unanswerable.

I answered the former objector, 5. 'Before those words which you suppose to imply such a restraint—were those spoken without any restraint or limitation at all, which I apprehend to convey an indelible character, Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the church of God, now committed unto thee, by the imposition of our hands.'

You reply, "The question is not, whether you are in orders, or not?" p. 12.—I am glad to hear it. I really thought it was.—"But whether you have acted suitably to the directions or rules of the Church of England."—Not suitably to that rule, if it were strictly to be interpreted, of preaching only in a single congregation. But I have given my reasons, why I think it cannot be so interpreted. And those reasons I do not see that you have invalidated.

I would only add, if I am in orders, if I am a minister still, and yet not a minister of the Church of England, of what church am I a minister? Whoever is a minister at all, is a minister of some particular church. Neither can he cease to be a minister of that church, till he is cast out of it by a judicial sentence. Till therefore I am so cast out, (which I trust will never be,) I must style myself, a minister of the Church of England.

6. Your next objection is, "You not only erect bands, which, after the Moravians, you call the United Society, *but also* give out tickets to those that continue therein."—These bands, you think, "have had very bad consequences, as was to be expected, when weak people are made leaders of their brethren, and are set upon expounding Scripture." Ibid. You are in some mistakes here. For, 1. *The bands*

are not called *the United Society*. 2. The *United Society* was originally so called, not after the Moravians, but because it consisted of several smaller societies *united together*. 3. Neither the bands, nor the leaders of them, as such, are *set upon expounding Scripture*. 4. The good consequences of their meeting together *in bands*, I know: but the *very bad consequences* I know not.

When any members of these, or of the *United Society*, are proved to live in known sin, we then mark and avoid them; we separate ourselves from every one that walks disorderly. Sometimes, if the case be judged infectious (though rarely,) this is openly declared. And this you style "excommunication," and say, "Does not every one see a separate, ecclesiastical society or communion?" (page 13.)—No. This society does not *separate* from the *communion* of the rest of the Church of England. They *continue steadfastly* with them, both 'in the apostolical doctrine, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers,' (which neither Mr. St. nor Mr. Si. does: nor the gentleman who writes to you in favour of the Moravians: who also writes pressingly to me to *separate* myself from the church) a society "over which you had appointed yourself a governor."—No: so far as I governed them, it was at their own entreaty.—"And took upon you all the spiritual authority, which the very highest church governor could claim."—What! At Kingswood? In February 1740-1? Not so. I took upon me no other authority (then and there at least) than any steward of a society exerts by the consent of the other members. I did neither more nor less than declare, that they who had broken our rules, were no longer of our society.

"Can you pretend that you received this authority from our church?"—Not by ordination; for I did not exert it as a *priest*: but as one whom that society had voluntarily chosen to be at the head of them.—"Or that you exercised it in subjection, or subordination to her lawful governors?" I think so; I am sure I did not exercise it in any designed opposition to them.—"Did you ever think proper to consult or advise with them, about fixing the terms of

your communion?" If you mean about fixing the rules of admitting or excluding from our society: I never did think it either needful or proper. Nor do I, at this day.

"How then will you vindicate all these powers?"—*All these* are, 'Declaring those are no longer of our society.' "Here is a manifest congregation. Either it belonged to the Church of England, or not. If it did not, you set up a separate communion against her. And how then are you injured, in being thought to have withdrawn from her?"—I have nothing to do with this. The antecedent is false. Therefore the consequent falls of course.—"If it did belong to the church, shew where the church gave you such authority of controling and regulating it?" Authority of putting disorderly members out of that society? The society itself gave me that authority. "What private clergyman can plead her commission, to be thus a judge and ordinary, even in his own parish?" Any clergyman or layman, without pleading her commission, may be thus a judge and ordinary. "Are not these powers inherent in her governors, and committed to the higher order of her clergy?" No: not the power of excluding members from a private society,—unless on supposition of some such rule as ours is, viz. 'That if any man separate from the church, he is no longer a member of our society.'

7. But you have more proof yet. "The grand jury in Georgia found, that you had called yourself ordinary of Savannah. Nor was this fact contradicted even by those of the jury, who you say wrote in your favour. So that it appears, you have long had an inclination, to be independent and uncontroled." This argument ought to be good; for it is far fetched. The plain case was this. That grand jury did assert, 'That in Mr. Causton's hearing, I had called myself ordinary of Savannah.' The minority of the jury, in their letter to the trustees, refuted the other allegations particularly: but thought this so idle an one, that they did not deign to give it any farther reply, than—'As to the eighth bill we are in doubt, as not well knowing the meaning of the word *ordinary*.' See Vol. I. p. 229, 230.

You add, "I appeal to any reasonable man, whether you have not acted as an *ordinary;* nay, a *bishop* in Kingswood." If you mean, in 'declaring those disorderly members were no longer of that society,' I admit your appeal, whether I therein acted as a *bishop*, or as any *steward* of a society may. "Nay you have gone far beyond the generality of the dissenters themselves; who do not commit the power of excommunication, and appointing to preach"—(that is another question) "to the hands of any private minister.—The powers of excommunication." True; but this was not *excommunication*, but a quite different thing.—How far, in what circumstances, and in what sense, I have *appointed men to preach*, I have explained at large in the third part of the *Farther Appeal*. But I wait for farther light; and am ready to consider, as I am able, whatever shall be replied to what is there advanced.

8. Your general conclusion is, "Whatever your pretences or professions may be, you can be looked upon by serious and impartial persons, (not as a *member*, much less a *minister* of the Church of England,) but as no other than an enemy to her constitution, worship, and doctrine, raising divisions and disturbances in her communion; (p. 76,) and yet you say, 'I cannot have greater regard to her rules'—'I dare not renounce communion with her.' (p. 15.)

I do say so still. I cannot have a greater regard to any *human rules*, than to follow them in all things, unless where I apprehend there is a *divine rule* to the contrary. I dare not *renounce communion* with the Church of England. As a *minister*, I teach her doctrines. I use her offices. I conform to her rubricks. I suffer reproach for my attachment to her. As a private *member* I hold her doctrines. I join in her offices, in prayer, in hearing, in communicating. I *expect* every reasonable man, touching these facts, to *believe his own eyes and ears*. But if these facts are so, how dare any man of common sense, charge me with *renouncing* the Church of England?

9. Use ever so many exaggerations, still the whole of this matter is, 1. I often use extemporary prayer.

2. Wherever I can, I preach the gospel. 3. Those who desire to *live the gospel* I advise how to watch over each other, and to put from them such as walk disorderly. Now whether these things are, on other considerations, right or wrong, this single point I must still insist on: "All this does not prove, either that I am no *member*, or that I am no *minister* of the Church of England." Nay, nothing can prove, I am no *member* of the church, till I either am *excommunicated*, or *renounce* her communion, and no longer join in her doctrine, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayer. Nor can any thing prove I am no *minister* of the church, till I either am *deposed* from my ministry, or *voluntarily renounce* her, and wholly cease to teach her doctrines, use her offices, and obey her rubricks for conscience' sake. However I grant, that whatsoever is, "urged on this head, deserves my most serious consideration." And whensoever I am *convinced*, that by taking any *methods*, more or less *different* from those I now take, I may better "consult the honour of religion, and be able to do more good in the world;" by the grace of God, I shall not persist in these one hour, but instantly choose the more excellent way.

IV. 1. What you urge on the head of *Enthusiasm* also, I think "deserves my most serious consideration." (You may add, "and presumption." I let it drop once more; because I do not love tautology; and because I look upon presumption to be essential to enthusiasm, and, consequently, contained therein.) I will, therefore, weigh what you advance concerning it, and explain myself something more at large.

"I am to examine," you say, (p. 120,) "how far you have cleared yourself of enthusiasm. My account of this you set down, making as many alterations and omissions as there are lines." Perhaps more; for I never designed to recite the whole, but only the material part of it. "If you did not wholly approve of it, why would you not let me know, what you disliked in it?" Because I do not love many words. Therefore when the argument stood thus: "He that does this is an enthusiast; but you do this:" I

was generally content with answering the 2d proposition, and leaving the first as I found it.

"I laid this charge against you and the Methodists in general: between you every part of the character has been verified." I answer for one; let the rest answer for themselves,—if they have not better employment. That the question between us may be the more fully understood, I shall briefly compare together, 1. Your remarks. 2. My answer. 3. Your reply: though still I cannot promise to repeat your words at length.

2. You remark, (p. 60,) "Though you would be thought an enemy to enthusiasm and presumption, yet in both, you are free from being inferior to the Moravians, or indeed to any others:" [strong assertions, *not inferior* to any others? Not to the French prophets, or John of Leyden?] "1. Enthusiasm is, a false persuasion of an extraordinary divine assistance, which leads men to such conduct, as is only to be justified by the supposition of such assistance." I answer, (p. 38,) 'Before this touches me, you are to prove, (which I conceive you have not done yet,) that my conduct is such, as is only to be justified by the supposition of such assistance." You reply (p. 120.) "This, I think, is proved in the preceding tract." I think not. Let men of candour judge. Yet I am persuaded, there was such an assistance at some times. You have also to prove that this was a *false* persuasion.

You remark, 2. "An enthusiast is then sincere, but mistaken." (p. 61.), I answered, 'That I am mistaken remains to be proved.' You reply, "The world must judge." Agreed, if by the world you mean, men of reason and religion.

You remark, 3. "His intentions must be good: but his actions will be most abominable." I answered, 'What actions of mine are most abominable?' You reply, "The world must be judge, whether your public actions have not been in many respects abominable." I am glad the charge softens. I hope by and by you will think they are only abominable in some respects.

You remark, 4. "Instead of making the word of God the rule of his actions, he follows only secret persuasion or impulse." I answered, 'I have declared again and again, that I make the word of God the rule of all my actions, and that I no more follow any *secret impulse* instead thereof, than I follow Mahomet or Confucius.' You reply (p. 121,) "You fall again into your strain of boasting, as if declarations could have any weight against facts; assert, that 'you make the word of God the rule of all your actions,' and that I 'perhaps do not know many persons.'"—Stop, Sir. You are stepping over one or two points, which I have not done with.

You remark, 5. "Instead of judging of his spiritual estate, by the improvement of his heart, he rests only on ecstasies," &c. I answered, 'Neither is this my case. I rest not on them at all. I judge of my spiritual estate by the improvement of my heart, and the tenour of my life conjointly.' To this I do not perceive you reply one word. Herein then I am not an enthusiast.

You remark, 6. "He is very liable to err—not considering things coolly and carefully." I answered, 'So indeed I am: I find it every day more and more. But I do not yet find, that this is owing to my want of "considering things coolly and carefully." Perhaps you do not know many persons (excuse my simplicity in speaking it) who more carefully consider every step they take, (p. 39.) Yet I know I am not cool or careful enough. May God supply this and all my wants!' You reply, "Your private life I have nothing to do with:" and then enlarge on my "method of consulting Scripture," and of using lots: of both which by and by. But, mean time, observe this does not affect the question. For I neither cast lots, nor use that method at all, till I have considered things with all the care I can. So that, be this right or wrong, it is no manner of proof, that I do not "carefully consider every step I take."

But how little did I profit by begging your excuse, suppose I had spoken a word unguardedly? O Sir, you put

me in mind of him who said, *I know not to shew mercy!* You have need never to fight, but when you are sure to conquer: seeing you are resolved neither to give nor take quarter.

You remark, 7. "He is very difficult to be convinced by reason and argument, as he acts upon a supposed principle superior to it, the direction of God's Spirit." I answered, 'I am very difficult to be convinced by dry blows or hard names. But not by reason or argument. At least that difficulty cannot spring from the cause you mention. For I claim no other direction of God's Spirit than is *common* to all believers.'

You reply (p. 124) 1.—"I fear this will not be easily reconcileable to your past pretences and behaviour." I believe it will; in particular to what I speak of the light I received from God in that important affair. (Vol. I. p. 349.) But as to the directions in general of the Spirit of God, we very probably differ in this; you apprehend those directions to be extraordinary, which I suppose to be common to all believers.

You remark, 8. "Whoever opposes him will be charged with resisting or rejecting the Spirit." I answered, 'What! Whoever opposes me, John Wesley? Do I charge every such person with *rejecting the Spirit?* No more than I charge him with robbing on the highway.—Do I charge *you* with rejecting the Spirit?' You reply, "You deny that you charge the opposers with rejecting the Spirit, and affirm, that you never said or thought, that what you do is to be accounted the work of God." Here you blend different sentences together, which I must consider apart, as they were written. And first, where do I charge you with rejecting the Spirit? If I charge whoever opposes me with this, undoubtedly I charge you. If I do not charge you, that proposition is false; I do not so charge whoever opposes me. Your next words are, "You affirm that you never said or thought, that what you do is to be accounted the work of God. If it be the work of God you need not deny the other point." Yes, Sir: whether it be or not, I

must still deny, that I ever charged you with rejecting the Spirit in opposing me.

You remark, 9. "His own dreams must be regarded as oracles." I answered, 'Whose? I desire neither my dreams nor my waking thoughts, may be regarded at all, unless just so far as they agree with the Oracles of God.' To this also you make no reply.

You remark, 10. "However wild his behaviour may be, whatever he does, is to be accounted the work of God." It was to this I answered, 'I never said so of what I do: I never thought so." This answer was ill expressed. And I might have foreseen, you would hardly fail to make your advantage of it. I must, therefore, explain myself upon it a little farther. You said, "An enthusiast accounts *whatever he does* to be the work of God." I should have said, 'but I do not account *whatever I do* to be the work of God." What that is, which I do account his work, will be considered by and by.

You remark, 11. "He talks in the style of inspired persons." I answered, 'No otherwise inspired, than you are, if you love God.' You reply, (p. 126,) "The point was not, whether you are actually inspired, but whether you have talked in the style of those who were so." That was so much the point, that if it were allowed, it would overturn your whole argument. For if I were inspired (in *your* sense) you could not term that inspiration enthusiasm without blasphemy; but you again mistake my words. The plain meaning of them is, that I talk in the style of those persons, who are 'no otherwise inspired than you are, if you love God.'

You remark, 12. "He applies Scripture phrases to himself, without attending to their original meaning, or once considering the difference of times and circumstances," (p. 62.) I answered, 'I am not conscious of any thing like this. I apply no Scripture phrase (p. 39,) either to myself or any other, without carefully considering both the *original meaning*, and the *secondary* sense, wherein, allowing for different times and circumstances, it may be applied

to ordinary Christians.' You reply, "This also you deny to have done; holding, however, some *secondary* sense, (what it is you have not told us,) in which Scripture phrases may be applied to ordinary Christians." I have largely told you, what I mean by a *secondary* sense, in the first part of the *Farther Appeal*. You add, (p. 126.) "Many things which were truly written of the preaching of Christianity at first, you have vainly applied to yourselves." Sir, I am to answer only for myself: as I will for that expression, 'Behold the day of the Lord is come; he is again visiting and redeeming his people!'

3. I come now to what you expatiate upon at large, as the two grand instances of enthusiasm. The first is plainly this. At some rare times when I have been in great distress of soul, or in utter uncertainty how to act, in an important case, which required a speedy determination: after using all other means that occurred, I have cast lots, or opened the bible. And by this means I have been relieved from that distress, or directed in that uncertainty. Instances of this kind occur in the Third Journal, Vol. I. p. 349, 351, 364, 365, 419; as also in the Fourth Journal, Vol. II. p, 24, 74. I desire any one who would understand this matter thoroughly, to read those passages as they stand at length.

As to the particular instances, I would observe, 1. That with regard to my first journey to Bristol, you should in any wise have set down those words, that preface the scriptures there recited. "I was entreated, in the most pressing manner, to come to Bristol without delay. This I was not at all forward to do: and, perhaps a little the less inclined to it, because of the remarkable scriptures which offered, as often as we inquired touching the consequence of this removal: though whether this was permitted only for the trial of our faith, God knoweth, and the event will shew.' From the scriptures afterwards recited, some inferred, that the event they apprehended, was yet afar off. I infer nothing at all. I still know not how to judge; but leave the whole to God. This only I know, that the continual expectation of death, was then an unspeakable

blessing to me: that I did not dare, knowingly, to waste a moment, neither to throw away one desire on earthly things: those words being ever uppermost in my thoughts, and, indeed, frequently on my tongue,

Ere long, when sov'reign wisdom wills,
My soul an unknown path shall tread,
Shall strangely leave, which strangely fills
This frame, and mingle with the dead.
O what is death? 'Tis life's last shore,
Where vanities are vain no more:
Where all pursuits their goal obtain,
And life is all re-touch'd again.

I observe, 2. That in two other of those instances, Third Journal, Vol. I. p. 349, 351, it is particularly mentioned, that "I was troubled;" and that by the seasonable application of those scriptures, that trouble was entirely removed. The same blessing I received (so I must term it still) from the words set down in the 419th page: and in a yet higher degree, from that exceeding apposite scripture mentioned in the Fourth Journal, Vol. II. p. 74.

I observe, 3. That at the times to which your other citations refer, I was utterly uncertain how to act, in points of great importance, and such as required a speedy determination: and that by this mean my uncertainty was removed, and I went on my way rejoicing. Vol. I. p. 348, 349, 351. Vol. II. p. 24.

My *own experience*, therefore, which you *think* should *discourage me for the future* from any thing of this kind, does, on the contrary, greatly encourage me herein; since I have found much benefit, and no inconvenience: unless perhaps this be one, that you *cannot acquit me of enthusiasm*: add, if you please, and presumption.

But you ask, "Has God ever commanded us to *do* thus?" I believe he has neither commanded nor forbidden it in Scripture. But then remember, 'That Scripture' (to use the words which you cite from *our learned and judicious* Hooker) 'is *not* the only rule of all things which in this life may be done by men.' All I affirm concerning this, is,

That it may be done; and that I have, in fact, received *assistance* and *direction* thereby.

4. I give the same answer to your assertion, (p. 123,) "that we are not ordered in Scripture to decide any point in question by *lots*." You allow, indeed, there are "instances of this in Scripture;" but affirm, these "were miraculous: nor can we without presumption" (a species of enthusiasm) "apply this method." I want proof of this: bring one plain text of Scripture, and I am satisfied. "This, I apprehend, you learned from the Moravians." I did; though it is true, Mr. Whitefield thought I went too far therein. "Instances of the same occur in your journals. I will mention only one. It being debated whether you should go to Bristol, you say, 'We at length all agreed to decide it by lot. And by this it was determined I should go.' (Vol. I. p. 364. Is this your way of carefully considering every step you take? Can there be greater rashness and extravagance? Reason is thus in a manner rendered useless: prudence is set aside, and affairs of moment left to be determined by chance!" (p. 124.)

So this you give as a genuine instance of my proceedings.—And, I suppose, of your own fairness and candour! 'We agreed at length to decide it by lot.' True, at *length:* after a debate of some hours: after carefully hearing and weighing coolly, all the reasons which could be alleged on either side: 'Our brethren still continuing the dispute, without any probability of their coming to one conclusion, we at length, (the night being now far spent) all agreed to this.' "Can there be greater rashness and extravagance?" I cannot but think there can. "Reason is thus in a manner rendered useless." No: we had used it as far as it could go: from Saturday, March 17, (when I received the first letter) to Wednesday 28, when the case was laid before the society. "Prudence is set aside:" Not so: but the arguments here were so equal, that we saw not how to determine. "And affairs of moment left to be determined by chance!" By chance? What a blunder

then is that, *The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposal thereof is of the Lord!*

This I firmly believe is truth and reason, and will be to the end of the world. And I therefore still subscribe to that declaration of the Moravian church, (laid before the whole body of divines in the university of Wirtemberg, and not by them accounted *enthusiasm,*) "We have a peculiar esteem for Lots, and accordingly use them both in public and private, to decide points of importance, when the reasons brought on each side, appear to be of equal weight. And we believe this to be then the only way, of wholly setting aside our own will, of acquitting ourselves of all blame, and clearly knowing what is the will of God." Third Journal, Vol. I. p. 331.

5. You next *remarked* several *instances* of my enthusiasm. The first was, That of Mrs. Jones. The next ran thus. "Again, you say, 'I expounded out of the fulness that was given me,' (p. 64.) I answered, 'I mean I had then a *fuller*, deeper sense (of what I spoke) than I *ordinarily* have,' (p. 41.) But if you still think, "It would have been more decent to have said, according to the best of my power and ability, with God's assistance, I expounded;" I will say so another time.

With regard to the third instance of enthusiasm, you *remarked*, "If you would not have us look on this as miraculous, there is nothing in it worthy of being related," (p. 64.) I answered, 'It may be so. Let it pass then as a trifle not worth relating; but still it is no proof of enthusiasm. For I would not have you look upon it as miraculous —But as a signal instance of God's particular providence, (p. 42.)' How friendly and generous is your reply! "You seem ashamed of it—I am glad you give this fooling up, and hope for the future you will treat your readers better," (p. 131.) Sir, I am not *ashamed of it*; nor shall I ever give *this fooling* up, till I give up the Bible. I still look upon this 'as a signal instance of God's particular providence.' But "how is this consistent with yielding it to be a trifle?" (p. 132.) My words do not imply, that I *yield* it so to be.

Being urged with the dilemma, 'Either this is related as miraculous, (and then it is enthusiasm,) or it is not worth relating:' I answered, (to avoid drawing the sword of controversy,) 'Let it pass then as a trifle not worth relating. But still (if it be a trifle, which I *suppose*, not grant,) it is no proof of enthusiasm. For I would not have you look upon it as miraculous.'

And yet I believe I yielded too much, and what might too much favour your assertion, that "there is a great difference between particular providences and such extraordinary interpositions." Pray, Sir, shew me what this difference is. It is a subject that deserves your coolest thoughts. "I know no ground—to hope or pray for such immediate reliefs. These things must be represented either as common accidents, or as miracles." I do not thoroughly understand your terms. What is a common *accident?* That a sparrow falls to the ground? Or something more inconsiderable than the hairs of your head? Is there no medium between accident and miracle? If there be, what is that medium? When we are agreed with regard to these few points, I shall be glad to resume the subject.

6. The fourth instance of my enthusiasm was this, that I "related judgments inflicted on my opposers." As to Mr. Molther, I must observe once more, that I do believe there was a particular providence in his sickness. But I do not believe, (nor did I design to insinuate,) that it was a judgment, for opposing *me*.

You go on. "Again, you mention 'as an awful providence, the case of a poor wretch who was last week cursing and blaspheming, and had boasted to many, that he would come again on Sunday, and no man should stop his mouth then. But on Friday God laid his hand upon him, and on Sunday he was buried," (p. 66.) I answered, 'I look on this as a manifest judgment of God on a hardened sinner, for his complicated wickedness, (p. 42.) You reply, (p. 133,) "Add, if you please, 'His labouring with all his might to hinder the word of God.' Here therefore is a confessed judgment, for his opposition to you." There is, for his *thus*

opposing with curses and blasphemy. This was part of his complicated wickedness. Here then you "think I plead guilty." Not of enthusiasm; till you prove, this was not 'an awful providence.'

"Again, 'One was just going to beat his wife, (which he frequently did,) when God smote him in a moment, so that his hand dropped, and he fell down upon the ground, having no more strength than a new-born child.' Have we any warrant either from Scripture, or the common dispensatsons of Providence, to interpret misfortunes of this nature as judgments?" (p. 67.) I answered, 'Can you, Sir, consider this, as one of the common dispensations of Providence? Have you known a parallel one in your life? But it was never cited by me (as it is by you) as an immediate punishment on a man for *opposing me*, (p. 42.) You reply, "As if what is not common, or what I have not known, must be a miraculous judgment." I believe it was, whether miraculous or not, a judgment mixed with mercy.

You now add to the rest the following instance: 'One John Haydon, a man of regular life and conversation, being informed, that people fell into strange fits at the societies, came to see and judge for himself. But he was still less satisfied than before; insomuch that he went about to his acquaintance one after another, and laboured above measure to convince them, it was a delusion of the devil. We were going home, when one met us in the street, and informed us, that J. H. was fallen raving mad. It seems he had sat down to dinner, but had a mind first to end the sermon on Salvation by Faith. In reading the last page he changed colour, fell off his chair, and began screaming terribly, and beating himself against the ground. The neighbours were alarmed, and flocked into the house. I came in and found him upon the floor, the room being full of people, whom his wife would have kept without, but he cried aloud, No; let them all come; let all the world see the just judgment of God. Two or three men were holding him as well as they could. He immediately fixed his eyes upon me, and cried, Ay, this is he, who I said was a deceiver of the peo-

ple. But God has overtaken me. I said, it was all a delusion. But this is no delusion. He then roared out, O thou devil! Thou cursed devil! Yea, thou legion of devils! Thou canst not stay. Christ will cast thee out. I know his work is begun. Tear me to pieces, if thou wilt, but thou canst not hurt me. He then beat himself against the ground again, his breast heaving at the same time, as in the pangs of death, and great drops of sweat trickling down his face. We all betook ourselves to prayer. His pangs ceased, and both his body and soul were set at liberty,' Vol. I. p. 372.

If you had pleased, you might have added from the next paragraph, 'Returning to J. H. we found his voice was lost, and his body weak as that of an infant. But his soul was in peace, full of love, and rejoicing in hope of the glory of God.'

You subjoin, "This you may desire for ought I know, to pass as a trifle too," (p. 134.) No; it is so terrible an instance of the judgment of God, (though at length *mercy rejoiced over judgment)* as ought never to be forgotten by those who fear God, so long as the sun or moon endureth.

7. The account of people falling down in fits you cite as a fifth instance of my enthusiasm: it being "plain," you say, that I "look upon both the disorders, and the removals of them to be supernatural," (p. 67.) I answered, 'It is not quite plain. I look upon some of these cases, as wholly natural: on the rest, as mixed: both the disorders and the removals, being partly natural and partly not.' (p. 43.) You reply, "It would have been kind, to have let us know your rule, by which you distinguish these." I will. I distinguish them by the circumstances, that precede, accompany, and follow. "However some of these you here allow, to be in part supernatural: Miracles therefore are not wholly ceased." Can you prove they are? By Scripture or reason? You then refer to two or three cases related in the third Journal, Vol. I. p. 370, 371. I believe there was a *supernatural* power, on the minds of the persons there mentioned, which occasioned their bodies to be so affected by

the *natural* laws of the vital union. This point therefore you have to prove, or here is no enthusiasm; that there was no *supernatural* power in the case.

Hereon you remarked, "You leave no room to doubt that you would have these cases considered, as those of the demoniacs in the New Testament, in order, I suppose, to parallel your supposed cures of them, with those highest miracles of Christ and his disciples, the casting out devils," (Rem. p. 68.) I answered, 'I should once have wondered at your making such a supposition. But I now wonder at nothing of the kind.' You reply, "Why so? What have I done lately, to take off your surprise? Have I forfeited my character for ingenuous and fair dealing with you?" (2d Let. p. 135.) Since you ask me the question, I will answer it, (I hope, in love, and in the spirit of meekness.) I scarcely know, of all who have written against me, a less ingenuous dealer: or one who has shewn a more steady, invariable disposition, to put an ill construction on whatever I say.

"But why would you not particularly explain these cases?" I will explain myself upon them once for all. For more than three hundred years after Christ, you know demoniacs were common in the church: and I suppose, that you are not unapprised that, during this period, (if not much longer,) they were continually relieved by the prayers of the faithful. Nor can I doubt, but demoniacs will remain, so long as Satan is the *god of this world.* I doubt not, but there are such at this day. And I believe John Haydon was one. But of whatever sort his disorder was, that it was removed by prayer is undeniable. Now, Sir, you have only two points to prove, and then your argument will be conclusive. 1. That to think or say, 'There are *demoniacs* now, and they are now relieved by prayer,' is enthusiasm: 2. That to say '*Demoniacs* were or are relieved on prayer made by Cyprian, or their parish-minister,' is to parallel the actions of Cyprian, or that minister, "with the highest miracles of Christ and his disciples."

3. You remarked, "It will be difficult to persuade any

sober person, that there is any thing supernatural in these disorders," (Rem. p. 69.) The remainder of that paragraph I abridged thus. You attempt to account for those fits, by "obstructions or irregularities of the blood and spirits; hysterical disorders; watchings, fastings; closeness of rooms, great crowds, violent heat." And, lastly, by "terrors, perplexities, and doubts, in weak and well-meaning men; which," you think, "in many of the cases before us, have quite overset their understandings," Rem. p. 43.

I answered, 'As to each of the rest, let it go as far as it can go. [Let it be supposed to have *some* influence in *some* cases; perhaps *fully to account for* one in a thousand.] But I require proof of the last way, whereby you would account for these disorders.' Why, "the instances," you say, "of religious madness, have much increased, since you began to disturb the world." 'I doubt the fact.' You reply, "This no way disproves it," (p. 137.) Yes, it does, till you produce some proof. For a bare negation is the proper and sufficient answer to a bare affirmation. I add, 'If these instances had increased daily, it is easy to account for them another way,' (as is done in the first part of the Farther Appeal.) You say, "Most have heard of or known, several of the Methodists, thus driven to distraction." I answered, 'You may have *heard* of five hundred. But how many have you *known?* Be pleased to name eight or ten of them. I cannot find them, no, not one of them to this day, either man, woman, or child,' (p. 44.) You reply, "This, *(the naming them)* would be very improper and unnecessary, (p. 138.)" However, Sir, it is extremely necessary, that you should name them to me in private, I will then, if required, excuse you to the public; which till then I cannot do.

The person I mentioned whom you *threw* into much *doubt* and *perplexity*, then lived in the parish of St. Ann, Westminster, I related the case just as she related it to me. But she is able and ready to answer for herself.

9. You go on, "It is the most charitable supposition we can make, that many of the cases you have mentioned in

your Journals, and some of which have been represented above, are of this kind," i. e. instances of madness, (2d L. p. 138.) O tender charity! But cannot your charity reach one hair's breadth farther than this?—No: for "otherwise [i. e. if those persons were not mad,] the presumption and despair are terrible indeed." But what if you were to suppose John Haydon (to instance in one) was not mad, but under a temporary possession? And that others were deeply convinced of sin, and of the wrath of God abiding on them? I should think this supposition (be it true or false) was fully as *charitable* as the other.

I said, 'I cannot find one such instance to this day.' You reply, "Yet once you could not but be under some 'concern, with regard to one or two persons, who *seemed* to be indeed lunatic, as well as sore vexed.'" 'So it *seemed*; but it soon appeared, they *were not*.' The very next paragraph mentions, that one of these within a few hours, was 'filled with the spirit of love, and of a sound mind.' Vol. I. p. 419.

But you are resolved, come what will, to carry this point: and so add, "Toward the end of your Farther Appeal," (the first part,) You say, "You have seen one instance of real, lasting madness. This was one whom you took with you to Bristol, who was afterwards prejudiced against you, and began a vehement invection both against your person and doctrines. In the midst of this he was struck raving mad." Add, 'And so he continued till his friends put him into Bedlam: and probably laid *his* madness to *my* charge.' And if they did not, it is now done to their hands.

10. "As to the cure of these fits, I observed (so you, p. 139, proceed) that you had frequently represented them as miraculous, as the instantaneous consequences of your prayers." My former answer to this was, 'I have set down the facts just as they were, passing no judgment upon them myself, and leaving every man else to judge as he pleases.'

I am glad you give me an occasion of reviewing this an-

swer; for upon reflection, I do not like it at all. It grants you more than I can in conscience do. As it can be proved by abundance of witnesses, that these cures were frequently (indeed almost always) the *instantaneous* consequences of prayer; your inference is just. I cannot, dare not affirm, that they were purely *natural*. I believe they were not. I believe many of them were wrought by the *supernatural* power of God. That of John Haydon in particular: (I fix on this, and will join issue with you upon it when you please,) and yet this is not *barefaced enthusiasm*. Nor can you prove it any enthusiasm at all, unless you can prove, that this is *falsely* ascribed to a *supernatural* power.

"The next case," you say, "relates to the spotted fever, which you represent as being extremely mortal; but—you believe there was not one with whom you were, but recovered. I allowed, that here is no intimation of any thing miraculous, (Rem. p. 72.) You ask, (Ans. p. 45,) 'Why then is this cited as an instance of my enthusiasm?'—You sure cannot think, that false pretences to miracles are the whole of enthusiasm." No; but I think they are *that part* of enthusiasm, which you here undertook to prove upon me. You are here to prove, that I "boast of curing bodily distempers by prayer, without the use of any other means," (Rem. p. 71.) But if "there is no *intimation*" in my account "of any thing miraculous, or that proper remedies had not been applied," how is this a proof, that I "boast of curing bodily distempers, without applying any remedies at all?"

"But you seem to desire to have it believed, that an extraordinary blessing attended your prayers. Whereas if the circumstances could be particularly inquired into, most probably it would appear, that either the fury of the distemper was abated, or the persons you visited were seized with it in a more favourable degree, or were by reason of a good constitution, more capable of going through it. Neither do I believe, that they would have failed of an equal blessing and success, had they had the assistance and prayers of their own parish ministers."

There, Sir; now I have done as you require: I have quoted your whole remark. But does all this prove, that I boast of curing bodily distempers by prayer, without the use of any other means?" If you say, although it does not prove this, it proves that "you seem to desire to have it believed, that an extraordinary blessing attended your prayers:" and this is another sort of enthusiasm:—it is very well: so it does not prove the conclusion you designed; but it proves another, which is as good!

11. The two last instances of my enthusiasm which you bring, (Rem. 72, 73,) I had summed up in two lines thus: 'At two several times, being ill and in violent pain, I prayed to God, and found immediate ease,' (Ans. p. 45.) But since you say, "I must not hope to escape so; these instances must once more be laid before me particularly," (p. 140,) I must yield to necessity, and set them down from the beginning to the end.

'Sat. March 21. I explained in the evening the 33d chapter of Ezekiel: in applying which, I was seized with such a pain in my side, I could not speak. I knew my remedy, and immediately kneeled down. In a moment the pain was gone.' Journ. 4, Vol. II. p. 71, 72.

'Friday, May 8. I found myself much out of order, however I made shift to preach in the evening. But on Saturday my bodily strength failed, so that for several hours I could scarcely lift up my head. Sunday 10, I was obliged to lie down most part of the day, being easy only in that posture.—In the evening—beside the pain in my back and head, and the fever which still continued upon me, just as I began to pray, I was seized with such a cough, that I could hardly speak. At the same time came strongly into my mind, *These signs shall follow them that believe.*—I called on Jesus aloud, To *increase my faith*, and to *confirm the word of his grace.* While I was speaking, my pain vanished away, the fever left me, my bodily strength returned, and for many weeks I felt neither weakness nor pain. Unto thee, O Lord, do I give thanks.' Journ. 4, Vol. II. p. 77, 78.

When you first cited these as proofs of enthusiasm, I answered, 'I will put your argument into form.

'He that believes those are miraculous cures which are not so, is a rank enthusiast: but

'You believe those are miraculous cures which are not so, therefore, you are a rank enthusiast.'

—'What do you mean by miraculous? If you term every thing so, which is "not strictly to be accounted for by the ordinary course of natural causes," then I deny the latter part of the minor proposition. And unless you can make this good, unless you can prove, the effects in question, are "strictly to be accounted for by the ordinary course of natural causes," your argument is nothing worth.'

You reply, "Your answer to the objection is very evasive, though you pretend to put my argument in form. You mistake the major proposition, which should have been:

"He that represents those cures as the immediate effects of his own prayers, and as miraculous, which are not so, is a rank enthusiast, if sincere:

"But this you have done: Ergo," &c.

To this clumsy syllogism I rejoin, 1. That the words, "if sincere," are utterly impertinent; for if *insincerity* be supposed, *enthusiasm* will be out of the question. 2. That those words, "as the effects of his own prayers," may likewise be pared off; for they are unnecessary and cumbersome, the argument being complete without them. 3. That with or without them, the proposition is false; unless so far as it coincides with that which you reject. For it is the *believing* those to be miracles which are not, that constitutes an *enthusiast:* not the *representing* them one way or the other; unless so far as it implies such a *belief.*

12. Upon my answer to the syllogism first proposed, you observe, "Thus" (by denying the latter part of the minor) "you clear yourself from the charge of enthusiasm, by acknowledging the cures to be supernatural and miraculous. Why then would you not speak out, and directly say, that you can work real and undoubted miracles? This would put the controversy between you and your opposers

on a short foot, and be an effectual proof of the truth of your pretences," (p. 142.)

V. 1. I have in some measure explained myself on the head of miracles in the third part of the *Farther Appeal.* But since you repeat the demand, (though without taking any notice of the arguments there advanced,) I will endeavour once more to give you a distinct, full, and determinate answer.

And, first, I acknowledge, that I have seen with my eyes, and heard with my ears, several things, which, to the best of my judgment, cannot be accounted for by the ordinary course of natural causes, and which, I therefore believe ought to be *ascribed to the extraordinary interposition of God.* If any man choose to style these *miracles*, I reclaim not. I have diligently inquired into the facts. I have weighed the preceding and following circumstances. I have strove to account for them in a *natural* way. I could not, without doing violence to my reason. Not to go far back, I am clearly persuaded, that the sudden deliverance of John Haydon, was one instance of this kind, and my own recovery, on May the 10th, another. I cannot account for either of these in a *natural* way. Therefore I believe they were both *supernatural.*

I must, secondly, observe, That the truth of these facts is supported by the same kind of proof, as that of all other facts is wont to be, namely, the testimony of competent witnesses: and that the testimony here is in as high a degree as any reasonable man can desire. Those witnesses were many in number: they could not be deceived themselves: for the facts in question they saw with their own eyes, and heard with their own ears. Nor is it credible, that so many of them would combine together, with a view of deceiving others; the greater part being men that feared God; as appeared by the general tenour of their lives. Thus, in the case of John Haydon, this thing was not contrived and executed in a corner, and in the presence of his own family only, or three or four persons prepared for the purpose. No; it was in an open street of the city of

Bristol, at one or two in the afternoon. And the doors being all open from the beginning, not only many of the neighbours from every side, but several others, (indeed whosoever desired it,) went in, till the house could contain no more. Nor yet does the account of my own illness and recovery *depend*, as you suppose, *on my bare word*. There were many witnesses both of my disorder on Friday and Saturday, and of my lying down most part of Sunday (a thing which they were well satisfied could not be the effect of a slight indisposition.) And all who saw me that evening, plainly discerned (what I could not wholly conceal) that I was in pain: about two hundred of whom were present when I was seized with that cough, which cut me short, so that I could speak no more; till I cried out aloud, 'Lord, increase my faith: Lord, confirm the word of thy grace.' The same persons saw and heard, that at that instant I changed my posture, and broke out into thanksgiving: that quickly after, I stood upright, (which I could not before,) and shewed no more sign either of sickness or pain.

Yet I must desire you well to observe, thirdly, That my will, or choice, or desire, had no place either in this, or any case of this kind, that has ever fallen under my notice. Five minutes before, I had no thought of this. I expected nothing less. I was willing to wait for a gradual recovery, in the ordinary use of outward means. I did not look for any other cure, till the moment before I found it. And it is my belief, that the case was always the same, with regard to the most *real and undoubted miracles*. I believe God never interposed his miraculous power, but according to his own sovereign Will: not according to the will of man; neither of him by whom he wrought, nor of any other man whatsoever. The wisdom as well as the power are his: nor can I find, that ever, from the beginning of the world, he lodged this power in any mere man, to be used whenever that man saw good. Suppose, therefore, there was a man now on earth, who did work *real and undoubted miracles*; I would ask, by whose power doth he work these? And at

whose pleasure? His own, or God's? Not his own; but God's. But if so, then your demand is not made on man, but on God. I cannot say it is modest, thus to challenge God; or well suiting the relation of a creature to his Creator.

2. However, I cannot but think, there have been already so many plain interpositions of divine power, as will shortly leave you without excuse, if you either deny or despise them. We desire no favour, but the justice that diligent inquiry may be made concerning them. We are ready to name the persons on whom that power was shewn, which belongeth to none but God; (not one or two, or ten or twelve only) to point out their places of abode; and we engage they shall answer every pertinent question, fairly and directly; and, if required, shall give all those answers upon oath, before any who are impowered so to receive them. It is our particular request, that the circumstances which went before, which accompanied, and which followed after, the facts under consideration, may be thoroughly examined, and punctually noted down. Let but this be done, (and is it not highly needful it should? at least by those who would form an exact judgment,) and we have no fear, that any reasonable man should scruple to say, *This hath God wrought!*

As there have been already so many instances of this kind, far beyond what we had dared to ask or think, I cannot take upon me to say, whether or not it will please God to add to their number. I have not herein *known the mind of the Lord*, neither am I *his counsellor*. He may, or he may not; I cannot affirm or deny. I have no light, and I have no desire either way. 'It is the Lord, let him do what seemeth him good.' I desire only to be as clay in his hand.

3. But what if there were now to be wrought ever so many "*real and undoubted miracles?*" (I suppose you mean by *undoubted*, such as being sufficiently attested, ought not to be doubted of.) Why, this, you say, "would put the controversy on a short foot, and be an effectual proof of the

truth of your pretences." By no means. As common as this assertion is, there is none upon earth more false. Suppose a teacher were now, on this very day, to work *real and undoubted miracles:* this would extremely little *shorten the controversy* between him and the greater part of his opposers. For all this would not force them to believe; but many would still stand just where they did before: seeing men may *harden their hearts* against miracles, as well as against arguments.

So men have done, from the beginning of the world: even against such signal, glorious miracles, against such interpositions of the power of God, as may not be again till the consummation of all things. Permit me to remind you only of a few instances; and to observe, that the argument holds *a fortiori:* for who will ever be impowered of God again, to work *such* miracles as these were? Did Pharaoh look on all that Moses and Aaron wrought, as an "effectual proof of the truth of their pretences?" Even when 'the Lord made the sea to be dry land, and the waters were divided:' when 'the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea, and the waters were a wall, on the right and on the left?' Exod. xiv. 21, 22. Nay;

The wounded dragon rag'd in vain;
And fierce the utmost plague to brave,
Madly he dar'd the parted main,
And sunk beneath th' o'erwhelming wave.

Was all this "an effectual proof of the truth of their pretences," to the Israelites themselves? It was not. 'They were *still* disobedient at the sea; even at the Red Sea!' Was the giving them day by day *bread from heaven*, an *effectual proof* to those 'two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown,' who said, with Dathan and Abiram, 'Wilt thou put out the eyes of these men? We will not come up.' Numb. xvi. 14. Nay, 'when the ground clave asunder that was under them, and the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up:' ver. 32, neither was this an *effectual proof* to those who saw it with their eyes, and heard the

cry of those that went down into the pit: but the very next day they 'murmured against Moses and against Aaron, saying, Ye have killed the people of the Lord!' ver. 41.

Was not the case generally the same with regard to the prophets that followed? Several of whom 'stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire,' did many mighty works; yet their own people received them not. Yet 'they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were slain with the sword; they were destitute, afflicted, tormented!' Utterly contrary to the commonly-received supposition, that the working *real undoubted miracles*, must bring all controversy to an end, and convince every gainsayer.

Let us come nearer yet. How stood the case between our Lord himself and his opposers? Did he not work *real and undoubted miracles?* And what was the effect? Still when 'he came to his own, his own received him not.' Still 'he was despised and rejected of men.' Still it was a challenge not to be answered, 'Have any of the rulers, or of the pharisees believed on him?' After this, how can you imagine, that whoever works miracles, must convince "all men of the truth of his pretences?"

I would just remind you of only one instance more. 'There sat a certain man at Lystra, impotent in his feet, being a cripple from his mother's womb, who never had walked. The same heard Paul speak: who steadfastly beholding him, and perceiving that he had faith to be healed, said with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked.'—Here was so *undoubted a miracle*, that the people 'lifted up their voices, saying—The gods are come down in the likeness of men.' But how long were even these convinced of *the truth of his pretences?* Only till 'there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium;' and then they 'stoned him' (as they supposed) to death! Acts xiv. 1, &c. So certain it is, that no miracles whatever, which were ever yet wrought in the

world, were *effectual* to *prove* the most glaring truth, to those that hardened their hearts against it.

4. And it will equally hold in every age and nation. 'If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be convinced' (of what they desire not to believe) 'though one rose from the dead.' Without a miracle, without one rising from the dead, εαν τις θελει ποιειν· 'if any man be willing to do his Will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God.' But if he be not willing to do his Will, he will never want an excuse, a plausible reason for rejecting it. Yea, though ever so many miracles were wrought to confirm it. For let ever so much 'light come into the world,' it will have no effect, (such is the wise and just Will of God,) on those who 'love darkness rather than light?' It will not convince those who do not simply desire to do the Will of their Father which is in heaven: those who mind earthly things; who, (if they do not continue in any gross outward sin, yet) love pleasure or ease; yet seek profit or power, preferment or reputation. Nothing will ever be an effectual proof to these of the holy and acceptable Will of God, unless first their proud hearts be humbled, their stubborn wills bowed down, and their desires brought, at least in some degree, into obedience to the law of Christ.

Hence, although it should please God to work a-new, all the wonders that ever were wrought on the earth, still these men, however *wise and prudent* they may be in things relating to the present world, would fight against God and all his messengers, and that in spite of all these miracles. Mean while God will reveal his Truth *unto babes*, unto those who are meek and lowly, whose desires are in heaven, who want to 'know nothing, save Jesus Christ and him crucified.' These need no outward miracle to shew them his will: they have a plain rule, the written Word. And 'the anointing which they have received of him, abideth in them, and teacheth them of all things,' (1 John ii. 27.) Through this they are enabled to bring all

doctrines 'to the Law, and to the Testimony.' And whatsoever is agreeable to this they receive, without waiting to see it attested by miracles. As on the other hand, whatever is contrary to this they reject; nor can any miracles move them to receive it.

5. Yet I do not know, that God hath any way precluded himself from thus exerting his sovereign power, from working miracles in any kind or degree, in any age to the end of the world. I do not recollect any scripture, wherein we are taught, that miracles were to be confined within the limits either of the Apostolic or Cyprianic age; or of any period of time, longer or shorter, even till the restitution of all things. I have not observed, either in the Old Testament or the New, any intimation at all of this kind. St. Paul says indeed once, concerning two of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, (so I think, that text is usually understood,) 'whether there be prophecies, they shall fail, whether there be tongues, they shall cease.' But he does not say, either that these or any other miracles shall cease, till faith and hope shall cease also: till they all be swallowed up in the vision of God, and love be all in all.

I presume you will allow, there is one kind of miracles (loosely speaking) which are not ceased; namely, τερατα ψευδους, *lying wonders*, diabolical miracles; or works beyond the virtue of natural causes, wrought by the power of evil spirits. Nor can you easily conceive that these will cease, as long as the father of lies is the prince of this world. And why should you think, that the God of truth is less active than he, or that he will not have his miracles also? Only not as man wills, neither when he wills; but according to his own excellent wisdom and greatness.

6. But even if it were supposed, that God does now work beyond the operation of merely natural causes, yet what impression would this make upon *you*, in the disposition your mind is now in? Suppose the trial were repeated, were made again to-morrow. One informs you the next day, 'While a clergyman was preaching yesterday, where

I was, a man came who had been long ill of an incurable distemper. Prayer was made for him, and he was restored to perfect health.'

Suppose now, that this were real fact, perhaps you would scarce have patience to hear the account of it: but would cut it short, in the midst, with, 'Do you tell this as something *supernatural?* Then miracles are not ceased!' But if you should venture to ask, Where was this? And who was the person that prayed? And it was answered, 'At the Foundry near Moorfields; the person who prayed was Mr. Wesley:' What a damp comes at once! What a weight falls on your mind, at the very first setting out? It is well if you have any heart or desire to move one step further. Or if you should, what a strong additional propensity do you now feel to deny the fact? And is there not a ready excuse for so doing? 'O! they who tell the story are doubtless *his own people:* most of whom, we may be sure, will *say* any thing for him, and the rest will *believe* any thing.'—But if you at length allowed the fact, might you not find means to account for it by *natural* causes? "Great crowds, violent heats, with obstructions, and irregularities of the blood and spirits," will do wonders.—If you could not but allow it was more than *natural*, might not some plausible reason be found for ranking it among the *lying wonders*, for ascribing it to the devil rather than God? And if, after all, you were convinced it was the finger of God, must you not still bring every doctrine advanced, to the Law and to the Testimony, the only sure and infallible test of all?—What then is the use of this continual demand, 'Shew us a sign and we will believe?' What will you believe? I hope no more than what is written in the Book of God. And thus far you might venture to believe, even without a miracle.

7. Let us consider this point yet a little farther. 'What is it you would have us prove by miracles? The doctrines we preach?' We prove these by scripture and reason; and, if need be, by antiquity. What else is it then we are to prove by miracles? At length we have a distinct

reply—"Wise and sober men will not otherwise be convinced," (i. e. unless you prove this by miracles), "that God is, by the means of such teachers, and such doctrines, working a great and extraordinary work in the earth," (Preface, p. 6.)—So then the determinate point which you, in their name, call upon us to prove by miracles, is this, "That God is, by these teachers, working a great and extraordinary work in the earth."—What I mean by a great and extraordinary work, is, the bringing multitudes of gross notorious sinners, in a short space, to the fear, and love, and service of God, to an entire change of heart and life.

Now then, let us take a nearer view of the proposition, and see which part of it we are to prove by miracles.

Is it, 1. That A. B. was, for many years, without God in the world, a common swearer, a drunkard, a sabbath-breaker?

Or, 2. That he is not so now.

Or, 3. That he continued so, till he heard these men preach, and from that time was another man?

Not so. The proper way to prove this fact, is, by the testimony of competent witnesses. And these witnesses are ready, whenever required, to give full evidence of them.—Or would you have us prove by miracles,

4. That this was not done by our own power or holiness? That God only is able to raise the dead, to quicken those who are dead in trespasses and sins?—Surely not. Whosoever believes the Scriptures, will want no new proof of this.

Where then is the *Wisdom* of those men, who demand miracles in proof of such a proposition? One branch of which, 'That such sinners were reformed by the means of these teachers,' being a plain fact, can only be proved by testimony, as all other facts are: and the other, 'That this is a *Work of God*, and *a great and more than ordinary work*,' needs no proof, as carrying its own evidence to every thinking man.

8. To sum up this. No truly *wise* or *sober* man can

possibly desire or expect miracles, to prove, either, 1. That these *doctrines* are true: this must be decided by scripture and reason; or, 2. That these *facts* are true: this can only be proved by testimony; or, 3. That to *change* sinners from darkness to light, is the *Work of God* alone; only using what instruments he pleases; this is glaringly self-evident; or, 4. That such a change wrought in so many notorious sinners, within so short a time, is a *great* and *extraordinary* work of God. This also carries its own evidence. What then is it which remains to be proved by miracles? Perhaps you will say, it is this: 'That God hath *called* or *sent* you to do this.' Nay, this is implied in the third of the foregoing propositions. If God has actually *used* us therein, if *his Work* hath in fact prospered in our hands, then he hath *called* or *sent* us to do this. I entreat reasonable men to weigh this thoroughly, whether the *fact* does not plainly prove the *call:* whether he who *enables* us thus to save souls alive, does not *commission* us so to do? Whether by *giving* us the *power* to pluck these brands out of the burning, he does not *authorize* us to exert it?

O that it were possible for you to consider calmly, whether the *success* of the gospel of Jesus Christ, even as it is preached by us, the least of his servants, be not itself a *miracle* never to be forgotten! One which cannot be denied, as being visible at this day, not in one but a hundred places: one which cannot be accounted for, by the ordinary course of any *natural cause* whatsoever; one which cannot be ascribed with any colour of reason, to *diabolical* agency; and, lastly, one which will bear the infallible test, the trial of the written Word.

VI. 1. But here I am aware of abundance of objections. You object, first, that to speak any thing of myself, of what I have done, or am doing now, is mere *boasting* and *vanity*. This charge you frequently repeat. So, p. 102, "The following page is full of *boasting*."—P. 113. "You *boast* very much of the numbers you have converted." And again, "As to myself, I hope I shall never be led to imitate you in *boasting*."—I think therefore it is needful, once for all,

to examine this charge thoroughly; and to shew distinctly, what that *good* thing is, which you disguise under this *bad* name.

From the year 1725 to 1729, I preached much, but saw no fruit of my labour. Indeed it could not be that I should; for I neither laid the foundation of *repentance*, nor of *believing the gospel:* taking it for granted, that all to whom I preached, were *believers;* and that many of them *needed no repentance.* 2. From the year 1729 to 1734, laying a deeper foundation of repentance, I saw a little fruit. But it was only a little; and no wonder. For I did not preach faith in the Blood of the Covenant. 3. From 1734 to 1738, speaking more of faith in Christ, I saw more fruit of my preaching, and visiting from house to house, than ever I had done before: though I know not, if any of those who were outwardly reformed, were inwardly and thoroughly converted to God. 4. From 1738 to this time, speaking continually of Jesus Christ, laying him only for the foundation of the whole building, making him all in all, the first and the last: preaching wholly on this plan, 'The kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the gospel:' The *Word of God ran* as fire among the stubble; it *was glorified* more and more: multitudes crying out, 'What must I do to be saved?' And afterwards witnessing, 'By grace we are saved through faith.' 5. I considered deeply with myself, what I ought to do? Whether to declare the things I had seen or not? I consulted the most serious friends I had. They all agreed, I ought to declare them: that the work itself was of such a kind, as ought in no wise to be concealed; and, indeed, that the unusual circumstances now attending it, made it impossible that it should. 6. This very difficulty occurred, 'Will not my speaking of this be *boasting?* At least, will it not be counted so?' They replied, 'If you speak of it as *your own* work, it will be *vanity* and *boasting* all over: but if you ascribe it wholly to God, if you give him all the praise, it will not. And if, after this, some will account it so still, you must be content, and bear the burden.' 7. I yielded,

and transcribed my papers for the press; only labouring, as far as possible, 'to render unto God the things which are God's, to give him the praise of his own work.

2. But this very thing you improve into a fresh objection. If I ascribe any thing to God, it is *enthusiasm*. If I do not (or if I do) it is *vanity and boasting*, supposing me to mention it at all. What then can I do to escape your censure? 'Why be silent, say nothing at all.' I cannot. I dare not. Were I thus to *please men*, I could 'not be the servant of Christ.'

You do not appear to have the least idea or conception of what is in the heart of one, whom it pleases him that worketh all in all, to employ in a work of this kind. He is in no wise forward to be at all employed therein; he starts back, again and again: not only, because he readily foresees, what shame, care, sorrow, reproach, what loss of friends and of all that the world accounts dear, will inevitably follow: but much more, because he (in some measure) knows himself. This chiefly it is which constrains him to cry out, (and that many times, in the bitterness of his soul, when no human eye seeth him,) 'O Lord! Send by whom thou wilt send! Only, send not me!—What am I? A worm! A dead dog! A man unclean in heart and lips!'—And when he dares no longer gainsay or resist, when he is at last 'thrust out into the harvest,' he looketh on the right hand, and on the left, he takes every step with fear and trembling, and with the deepest sense (such as words cannot express) of, 'Who is sufficient for these things?' Every gift which he has received of God, for the furtherance of his Word, whether of nature or grace, heightens this fear, and increases his jealousy over himself: knowing that so much the stricter must the inquiry be, when he gives an account of his stewardship. He is most of all jealous over himself, when the work of the Lord prospers in his hands. He is then amazed and confounded before God. Shame covers his face. Yea, when he sees, that he ought "to praise the Lord for his goodness, and to declare the wonders which he

doth for the children of men,' he is in a strait between two: he knows not which way to turn: he cannot speak: he dares not be silent It may be, for a time he 'keeps his mouth with a bridle; he holds his peace even from good. But his heart is hot within him,' and constrains him at length, to declare what God hath wrought. And this he then doth in all simplicity, with 'great plainness of speech,' desiring only to commend himself to him, who 'searcheth the heart and trieth the reins: and, (whether his words are the *savour of life* or *of death* to others) to have that witness in himself, 'as of sincerity, as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ.' If any man counts this *boasting*, he cannot help it. It is enough, that a higher Judge standeth at the door.

3. But you may say, 'Why do you talk of the *success* of the gospel in England, which was a Christian country before you were born?' Was it indeed? Is it so at this day? I would explain myself a little on this head also.

And, 1. None can deny, that the people of England, in general, are *called* Christians. They are *called* so, a few only excepted, by others, as well as by themselves. But I presume no man will say, that the *name* makes the *thing;* that men *are* Christians, barely because they are *called* so. It must be, 2. allowed, that the people of England, generally speaking, have been *christened* or baptized. But neither can we infer, these were once *baptized;* therefore they *are* Christians now. It is, 3. allowed, that many of those who were once *baptized*, and are *called Christians* to this day, *hear* the word of God, attend *public prayers*, and partake of the *Lord's supper*. But neither does this prove, that they *are* Christians. For notwithstanding this, some of them live in open sin: and others (though not conscious to themselves of *hypocrisy*, yet) are utter strangers to the *religion of the heart:* are full of pride, vanity, covetousness, ambition; of hatred, anger, malice, or envy; and consequently, are no more *scriptural* Christians, than the open drunkard or common swearer.

Now these being removed, where are the Christians,

from whom we may properly term England a *Christian country?* The men who have the mind which was in Christ, and who walk as he also walked? Whose inmost soul is renewed after the image of God; and who are outwardly holy, as he who hath called them is holy? There are doubtless a few such to be found. To deny this would be *want of candour.* But how few! How thinly scattered up and down! And as for a Christian, visible church, or a body of Christians, visibly united together, where is this to be seen!

Ye different sects, who all declare,
Lo! here is Christ, or Christ is there;
Your stronger proofs *divinely* give,
And *shew* me, where *the Christians* live!

And what use is it of, what good end does it serve, to term England a *Christian country?* (although it is true, most of the natives are *called* Christians, have been *baptized*, frequent the *ordinances:* and although a real Christian is here and there to be found, 'as a light shining in a dark place:') Does it do any honour to our great Master among those who are not *called* by his Name? Does it recommend Christianity to the Jews, the Mahometans, or the avowed Heathens? Sure no one can conceive it does. It only makes Christianity stink in their nostrils. Does it answer any *good end* with regard to those on whom this worthy name is called? I fear not; but rather an exceeding bad one. For does it not keep multitudes easy in their Heathen *practice?* Does it not make or keep still greater numbers satisfied with their Heathen *tempers?* Does it not directly tend to make both the one and the other imagine, that they *are* what indeed they *are not?* That they *are Christians*, while they are utterly without Christ, and without God in the world?—To close this point: if men are not *Christians*, till they are renewed after the image of Christ, and if the *people of England* in general are not thus renewed, why do we term them so? 'The God of this world hath *long* blinded their hearts.' Let us do nothing to increase that blindness: but rather labour to recover them

from that *strong delusion*, that they may no longer *believe a lie.*

4. Let us labour to convince all mankind, that to be a real Christian, is, to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and to serve him with all our strength; to love our neighbour as ourselves, and therefore do unto every man as we would he should do unto us. "Nay," you say, "had you confined yourselves to these great points, there would have been no objection against your doctrine. But the doctrines you have distinguished yourselves by—are not the love of God and man, but many false and pernicious errors," p. 104.

I have again and again, with all the plainness I could, declared what our constant doctrines are; whereby we are distinguished only from Heathens or nominal Christians; not from any that worship God in spirit and in truth. Our main doctrines, which include all the rest, are three, that of repentance, of faith, and of holiness. The first of these we account, as it were, the porch of religion; the next, the door; the third religion itself. That repentance, or conviction of sin, which is always previous to faith, (either in a higher or lower degree, as it pleases God,) we describe in words to this effect:

'When men *feel* in themselves the heavy burden of sin, see damnation to be the reward of it, behold with the eye of their mind the horror of hell: they tremble, they quake, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, and cannot but accuse themselves, and open their grief unto Almighty God, and call unto him for mercy. This being done seriously, their mind is so occupied, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that all desire of meat and drink is laid apart, and loathing of all worldly things and pleasure cometh in place. So that nothing then liketh them more, than to weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour of body, to shew themselves weary of life.'

Now permit me to ask, what if before you had observed, that these were the very words of our own church, one of *your* acquaintance or parishioners had come and told you, that ever since he heard a sermon at the Foundry, he *saw damnation* before him, *and beheld with the eye of his mind the horror of hell?* What, if he had *trembled and quaked*, and been so taken up, *partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from the danger of hell and damnation*, as to *weep, to lament, to mourn, and both with words and behaviour to shew himself weary of life?* Would you have scrupled to say, Here is another *deplorable instance* of the *Methodists driving men to distraction!* "See, into what excessive terrors, frights, doubts, and perplexities, they throw weak and well-meaning men! Quite oversetting their understandings and judgments, and making them liable to all these miseries."

I dare not refrain from adding one plain question, which I beseech you to answer, not to me, but to God. Have you ever experienced this *repentance* yourself? Did you ever *feel in yourself that heavy burden of sin?* Of sin in general; more especially, inward sin? Of pride, anger, lust, vanity? Of (what is all sin in one) that carnal mind, which is enmity, essential enmity against God? Do you know by experience what it is, *To behold with the eye of the mind the horror of hell?* Was *your mind* ever so taken up, partly with sorrow and heaviness, partly with an earnest desire to be delivered from this danger of hell and damnation, that even all desire of meat and drink was taken away, and you loathed all worldly things and pleasure? Surely if you had known, what it is, to have the *arrows of the Almighty* thus *sticking fast in you*, you could not so lightly have condemned those who now cry out, *The pains of hell come about me: the sorrows of death compass me, and the overflowings of ungodliness make me afraid.*

5. Concerning the gate of religion, (if I may be allowed so to speak,) the true, Christian, saving faith, we believe it implies abundantly more than an assent to the truth of the

Bible. 'Even the devils believe, that Christ was born of a virgin; that he wrought all kinds of miracles; that for our sakes he suffered a most painful death to redeem us from death everlasting. These articles of our faith the very devils believe, and so they believe all that is written in the Old and New Testament. And yet for all this faith, they be but devils. They remain still in their damnable estate, lacking the very true Christian faith. The right and true Christian faith is, Not only to believe that the holy Scriptures and the articles of our faith are true, but also to have a sure trust and confidence to be saved from everlasting damnation through Christ.' Perhaps it may be expressed more clearly thus, 'A sure trust and confidence which a man hath in God, that by the merits of Christ his sins are forgiven, and he reconciled to the favour of God.'

For giving this account of Christian faith, (as well as the preceding account of repentance, both which I have here also purposely described, in the very terms of the Homilies,) I have been again and again, for near these eight years past, accused of enthusiasm: sometimes by those who spoke to my face, either in conversation, or from the pulpit: but more frequently by those who chose to speak in my absence; and not seldom from the press. I wait for those who judge this to be enthusiasm, to bring forth their strong reasons. Till then, I must continue to account all these, the words of truth and soberness.

5. Religion itself, (I choose to use the very words, wherein I described it long ago,) we define, 'The loving God with all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves, and in that love abstaining from all evil, and doing all possible good to all men.' The same meaning we have sometimes expressed a little more at large, thus: 'Religion we conceive to be no other than love; the love of God and of all mankind: the loving God with all our heart, and soul, and strength, as having first loved us, as the fountain of all the good we have received, and of all we ever hope to enjoy: and the loving every soul which God hath made, every man on earth as our own soul.

'This love we believe to be the medicine of life, the never-failing remedy for all the evils of a disordered world, for all the miseries and vices of men. Wherever this is, there are virtue and happiness, going hand in hand. There is humbleness of mind, gentleness, long-suffering, the whole image of God, and at the same time, a peace that passeth all understanding, and joy unspeakable, and full of glory. This religion we long to see established in the world, a religion of love, and joy, and peace; having its seat in the heart, in the inmost soul, but ever shewing itself by its fruits: continually springing forth, not only in all innocence, (for love worketh no ill to his neighbour,) but likewise in every kind of beneficence, spreading virtue and happiness all around it.'

If this can be proved by Scripture or reason, to be enthusiastic or erroneous doctrine, we will then plead guilty to the indictment, of *teaching error and enthusiasm*. But if this be the genuine religion of Christ, then will all who advance this charge against us, be found false witnesses before God, in the day when he shall judge the earth.

7. However, with regard to the fruits of our teaching, you say, "It is to be feared, the numbers of serious men who have been perplexed and deluded, are much greater than the numbers of notorious sinners, who have been brought to repentance and good life, (p. 113.) Indeed, if you could prove,—that the Methodists were in general, very wicked people before they followed you, and that all you have been teaching them is, the love of God and their neighbour, and a care to keep his commandments, which accordingly they have done since, you would—stop the mouths of all adversaries at once. But—we have great reason to believe, that the generality of Methodists, before they became so, were serious, regular, and well-disposed people," p. 103.

If the question were proposed, "Which are greater, the numbers of serious men who have been perplexed and deluded, or of notorious sinners who have been brought to repentance and good life" by these preachers, throughout

England, within seven years: it might be difficult for you to fix the conclusion. For England is a place of wide dimensions; nor is it easy to make a satisfactory computation, unless you confine yourself within a smaller compass. Suppose then we were to contract the question, in order to make it a little less unwieldy. We will bound our inquiry, for the present, within a square of three or four miles. It may be certainly known by candid men, both what has been and what is now done within this distance. And from hence they may judge of those fruits elsewhere, which they cannot be so particularly informed of.

Inquire then, "Which are greater, the numbers of serious men, perplexed and deluded by these teachers, or of notorious sinners brought to repentance and good life," within the forest of Kingswood? Many indeed of the inhabitants are nearly as they were; are not much better or worse for their preaching; because the neighbouring clergy and gentry have successfully laboured to deter them from hearing it. But between three and four hundred of those who would not be deterred, are now under the care of those preachers. Now, what number of these were "serious Christians" before? Were fifty? Were twenty? Were ten? Peradventure there might five such be found. But it is a question, whether there could or not. The remainder were gross, open sinners, common swearers, drunkards, sabbath-breakers, whoremongers, plunderers, robbers, implacable, unmerciful, wolves and bears in the shape of men. Do you desire instances of more "notorious sinners" than these? I know not if Turkey or Japan can afford them. And what do you include in "repentance and a good life?" Give the strictest definition thereof that you are able: and I will undertake, these once notorious sinners, shall be weighed in that balance, and not found wanting.

8. Not that all the "Methodists (so called) were very wicked people before they followed us." There are those among them, and not a few, who are able to stop the boasting of those that despise them, and to say *Wherein soever any of you is bold, I am bold also*: only they *count all these things*

but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus. But these we found, as it were, when we sought them not. We went forth to *seek that which was lost:* (more eminently lost,) *to call* the most flagrant, hardened, desperate *sinners to repentance.* To this end we preached in the Horse-fair at Bristol, in Kingswood, in Newcastle: among the colliers in Staffordshire, and the tinners in Cornwall: in Southwark, Wapping, Moorfields, Drury-Lane, at London. Did any man ever pick out such places as these, in order to find "serious, regular, well-disposed people?" How many such might then be in any of them I know not. But this I know, that four in five of those who are now with us, were not of that number, but were wallowing in their blood, till God by us said unto them, *Live.*

Sir, I willingly put the whole cause on this issue: what are the *general consequences* of this preaching? Are there more *tares* or *wheat?* More "good men destroyed," (that is the proper question,) or "wicked men saved?" The last place where we began constant preaching, is a part of Wiltshire and Somersetshire, near Bath. Now let any man inquire at Rhode, Bradford, Wraxall, or among the colliers at Coleford, 1. What kind of people were those, "before they followed these men?" 2. What are the *main doctrines* they have been teaching for this twelvemonth? 3. *What effect* have these doctrines upon their followers? What manner of lives do they lead now? And if you do not find, 1. That three in four of these were two years ago notoriously wicked men. 2. That the main doctrines they have heard since were, 'Love God and your neighbour, and carefully keep his commandments.' And, 3. That they have since exercised themselves herein, and continue so to do: I say, if you or any reasonable man, who will be at the pains to inquire, does not find this to be an unquestionable fact, I will openly acknowledge myself an enthusiast, or whatsoever else you shall please to style me.

Only one caution I would give to such an inquirer, let him not ask the *colliers* of Coleford, "Were not the generality of you, before you followed these men, serious, regu-

lar, well-disposed people?" Were you not "offended at the profaneness and debauchery of the age?" And "was it not this disposition, which at first made you liable to receive these impressions?" (p. 103.) Because if he talk thus to some of those who do not yet "follow these men," perhaps he will not live to bring back their answer.

But will this, or a thousand such instances as these, "stop the mouths of all adversaries at once?" O Sir, would one expect such a thought as this, in one that had read the Bible? What if you could convert as many sinners as St. Paul himself? Would that "stop the mouths of all your adversaries?" Yea, if you could convert three thousand at one sermon, still you would be so far from "stopping all their mouths at once," that the greater part of them would 'gnash upon you with their teeth,' and cry, 'Away with such a fellow from the earth.'

I never therefore expect "to persuade the world," the majority of mankind, that I "have been" for some years "advancing nothing but what has a clear, immediate connection with 'the true knowledge and love of God:' that God hath been pleased to use me, a weak, vile worm, in reforming many of my fellow sinners, and making them, at this day, living witnesses of inward and pure religion: and that many of these, from living in all sin, are quite changed, are become so far holy, that though they are not free from all sin, yet no sin hath dominion over them. And yet I do firmly believe, "it is nothing but downright prejudice, to deny or oppose any of these particulars." Preface p. v.

"Allow Mr. Wesley," you say, "but these few points, and he will defend his conduct—beyond exception"—That is most true. If I "have" indeed "been advancing nothing but the true knowledge and love of God:" if God has made me an instrument in reforming many sinners, and bringing them to "inward and pure religion:" and if many of these continue holy to this day, and free from all wilful sin, then may I, even I, use those awful words, 'He that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.' But I never expect the world to allow me one of these points. How-

ever, I must go on, as God shall enable me. I must lay out whatsoever he trusts me with, (whether others will believe I do it or not,) in advancing the Christian knowledge of God, and the love and fear of God among men: in reforming (if so be it please him to use me still) those who are yet without God in the world; and in propagatiug inward and pure religion, righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

10. But you believe, "I only corrupt those who were good Christians before, teaching them to revile and censure their neighbours, and to abuse the clergy, notwithstanding all their meekness and gentleness, as I do myself." "I must declare," say you, "we have in general answered your pretence, with all meekness and temper—the railing and reviling have been chiefly on the side of the Methodists," p. 16.

Your first charge ran thus, (Rem. p. 15.) "How have such abuses as these been thrown out by you—against our—regular clergy, not the highest or the worthiest excepted!" I answered, 'I am altogether clear in this matter, as often as it has been objected: neither do I desire to receive any other treatment from the clergy, than they have received from me to this day,' p. 30.

You reply, 1. "One instance of your misrepresenting and injuring a preacher of our church I mentioned," (p. 105.) "Mentioned!" Well: but did you *prove* it was an *injury* or *misrepresentation?* I know not that you once attempted it. 2. You next quote part of a letter from the third Journal; wherein (according to your account) the "most considerable of our clergy are abused, and at once accused in a very gross manner," (p. 106.) Set down the whole paragraph, and I will prove, that this also is naked truth, and no abuse at all. You say, 3. "You approved of Whitefield's railing against the clergy"—i. e. I say, 'Mr. Wh. preached, concerning the *Holy Ghost which all who believe are to receive;* not without a just, though severe censure of those, who preach as if there were no Holy Ghost,' (Third Journal, Vol. I. p. 395.) Nor is this railing, but melancholy truth. I have myself heard several

preach in this manner. 4. You cite my words, 'Woe unto you, ye blind leaders of the blind! How long will ye pervert the right ways of the Lord?'—And add, "I appeal to yourself, whether you did not design this reflection against the clergy in general who differ from you?" No more than I did against Moses and Aaron. I expressly specify whom I design: 'Ye who tell the mourners in Zion, Much religion hath made you mad.' You say, 5. (with a N. B.) "All the clergy who differ from you, you style so, (p. 412,) in which and the foregoing page you causelessly slander them, as speaking of their own holiness—as that for the sake of which, on account of which we are justified before God."

Let any serious person read over those pages. I therein slander no man. I speak what I know; what I have both heard and read. The men are alive, and the books are extant. And the same conclusion I now defend, touching that *part of* the clergy who preach or write thus, viz. 'If they preach the truth as it is in Jesus, I am found a false witness before God. But if I preach the way of God in truth, then they are blind leaders of the blind.' 6. You quote those words, 'Nor can I be said to intrude into the labours of those who do not labour at all; but suffer thousands of those for whom Christ died, to perish for lack of knowledge,' (Third Journal, Vol. I. p. 399.) I wrote that letter near Kingswood. I would to God the observation were not terribly true! 7. The first passage you cite from the Earnest Appeal, evidently relates to *a few* only among the clergy: and if the charge be true, but of one in five hundred, it abundantly *supports* my reasoning. 8. In the next passage, I address all those, and those only, who affirm that I preach for gain.

You conclude, "The reader has now before him the manner in which you have been pleased to treat the clergy—and your late sermon—is too fresh an instance of—the like usage of the universities." It is an instance of 'speaking the truth in love.' So I desire all mankind may *use* me. Nor could I have said less either to the university or the clergy, without sinning against God and my own soul.

11. But I must explain myself a little on that practice, which you so often term "abusing the clergy." I have many times great sorrow and heaviness in my heart, on account of these my brethren. And this sometimes constrains me to speak to them, in the only way which is now in my power: and sometimes (though rarely) to speak of them; of a few, not all, in general. In either case, I take an especial care, 1. To speak nothing but the truth. 2. To speak this with all plainness; and, 3. With love, and in the spirit of meekness. Now if you will call this "abusing, railing," or "reviling," you must. But still I dare not refrain from it. I must *thus rail, thus abuse* sinners of all sorts and degrees, unless I will perish with them.

When I first read your declaration, That our brethren "in general had treated us with all meekness and temper," I had thoughts of spreading before you a few of the flowers which they have strewed upon us with no sparing hand. But on reflection, I judged it better to forbear. Let them die and be forgotten!

As to those of the "people called Methodists," whom you suppose to "rail at and abuse the clergy," and to *revile* and *censure* their neighbours; I can only say, Which are they? Shew me the men. And if it appear, that any of these under my care, habitually *censure* or *revile* others, whether clergy or laity, I will make them an example, for the benefit of all the rest.

Touching *you*, I never was *afraid* without cause. I do not think you advanced a *wilful untruth*. This was a rash word. I hereby openly retract it, and ask pardon of God and you.

To draw toward a conclusion. Whosoever they are that 'despise me, and make no account of my labours,' I know that they are 'not in vain in the Lord,' and that I have not 'fought as one that beateth the air.' I still see (and I praise 'the Father of lights, from whom every good and perfect gift descendeth') a continual increase of pure religion, and undefiled, of the love of God and man, of the 'wisdom which is pure and peaceable, gentle and easy to

be entreated, full of mercy, and of good fruits.' I see more and more of those 'who before lived in a thorough contempt of God's ordinances, and of all duties, now zealously discharging their duties to God and man, and walking in all his ordinances blameless.' A few indeed I have seen draw back to perdition, chiefly through a fear of being *righteous over-much.* And here and there one has fallen into Calvinism, or turned aside to the Moravians. But I doubt not, these 'are in a better state than they were before they heard us.' Admit they are in error, yea, and die therein, yet who dares affirm, they will perish everlastingly? But had they died in gross sin, we are sure they had fallen into 'the fire that never shall be quenched.'

I have now considered, as far as my time would permit, (not *every thing* in your letter, *whether of moment or not,* but) those points, which I conceive to be of the greatest weight. That God may lead us both into all truth, and that we may not drop our love in the pursuit of it, is the continual prayer of,

Reverend Sir,

Your Friend and Servant for Christ's sake,

JOHN WESLEY.

June 17, 1746.

A LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON;

OCCASIONED BY

HIS LORDSHIP'S LATE CHARGE TO HIS CLERGY.

"Let me not, I pray you, accept any man's person, neither let me give flattering titles unto man. For I know not to give flattering titles. In so doing my Maker would soon take me away,"

JOB xxxiii. 21, 22.

MY LORD,

1. WHEN abundance of persons have for several years laid to my charge things that I knew not, I have generally thought it my duty to pass it over in silence, to be *as one that heard not.* But the case is different, when a person of your Lordship's character calls me forth to answer for myself. Silence now might be interpreted contempt. It might appear like a sullen disregard, a with-holding honour from him to whom honour is due, were it only on account of his high office in the church. More especially, when I apprehend so eminent a person as this, to be under considerable mistakes concerning me. Were I now to be silent, were I not to do what was in my power for the removal of those mistakes, I could not have a conscience void of offence, either towards God or towards man.

2. But I am sensible, how difficult it is to speak in such a manner as I ought, and as I desire to do. When your lordship published those queries, under the title of *Observations*, I did not lie under the same difficulty; because, as your name was not inscribed, I had 'the liberty to stand, as it were, on even ground.' But I must now always remember to whom I speak. And may 'the God whom I serve in the gospel of his Son,' enable me to do it with deep seriousness of spirit, with modesty and humility; and at the same time, with the utmost plainness of speech; seeing we must both stand before the Judgment Seat of CHRIST.

3. In this then I entreat your lordship to bear with me: and in particular, when I speak of myself, (how tender a point!) just as freely as I would of another man. Let not this be termed boasting. Is there not a cause? Can I refrain from speaking, and be guiltless? And if I speak at all, ought I not to speak (what appears to me to be) the whole truth? Does not your lordship desire, that I should do this? I will then, God being my helper. And you will bear with me in my folly, (if such it is) with my speaking in the simplicity of my heart.

4. Your lordship begins, "There is another species of enemies, who—give shameful disturbance to the parochial clergy, and use very unwarrantable methods, to prejudice their people against them, and to seduce their flocks from them—the Methodists and Moravians, who—agree in annoying the established ministry, and in drawing over to themselves the lowest and most ignorant of the people, by pretences to greater sanctity," p. 4.

But have no endeavours been used to shew them their error? Yes: your lordship remarks, "Endeavours have not been wanting.—But though these endeavours have caused some abatement in the pomp and grandeur with which these people for some time acted," (truly one would not have expected it from them!) "yet they do not seem—to have made an impression upon their leaders," p. 6. Your lordship adds, "Their innovations in points of discipline, I do not intend to enter into at present—But to

inquire what the doctrines are which they spread, (p. 7.)—Doctrines big with pernicious influences upon practice," p. 8.

Six of these your lordship mentions, after having premised, "It is not at all needful, to the end of guarding against them, to charge the particular tenets upon the particular persons among them," (p. 7.) Indeed, my lord, it is needful in the highest degree. For if the minister who is to guard his people, either against Peter Bohler, Mr. Whitefield, or me, does not know what our particular tenets are, he must needs 'run, as uncertainly, and fight, as one that beateth the air.' I will fairly own, which of these belongs to me. The "indirect practices" which your lordship charges upon me, may then be considered; together with the "consequences" of these doctrines, and your lordship's instructions to the clergy.

5. "The first that I shall take notice of," says your lordship, "is the Antinomian doctrine," (p. 8.) The second, "That Christ has done all, and left nothing for us to do, but to believe," (p. 9.) These belong not to me. I am unconcerned therein. I have earnestly opposed, but did never teach or embrace them.

"There is another notion," your lordship says, "which we find propagated throughout the writings of those people, and that is, the making inward, secret, and sudden impulses the guides of their actions, resolutions, and designs," (p. 14.) Mr. Church urged the same objection before. "Instead of making the word of God the rule of his actions, he follows only his secret impulse,"—I beg leave to return the same answer. 'In the whole compass of language there is not a proposition which less belongs to me than this. I have declared again and again, that I make the word of God *the rule* of all my actions; and that I no more follow any *secret impulse* instead thereof, than I follow Mahomet or Confucius.' Answ. to Mr. Church.

6. Before I proceed, suffer me to observe, here are three grievous errors, charged on the Moravians, Mr. Whitefield, and me, conjointly, in none of which I am any more con-

cerned, than in the doctrine of the Metempsychosis! But it was "not needful to charge particular tenets on particular persons." Just as needful, my lord, as it is not to put a stumbling-block in the way of our brethren: not to lay them under an almost insuperable temptation, of condemning the innocent with the guilty. I beseech your lordship to answer in your own conscience before God, whether you did not foresee how many of your hearers would charge these tenets upon *me*? Nay, whether you did not design they should? If so, my lord, is this Christianity? Is it humanity? Let me speak plainly. Is it honest heathenism?

7. I am not one jot more concerned in instantaneous justification, as your lordship explains it, viz. "A sudden instantaneous justification, by which the person receives from God, a certain seal of his salvation, or absolute *assurance* of being saved at last," (p. 11.) "Such an instantaneous working of the Holy Spirit, as finishes the business of salvation once for all," (Ibid.) I neither teach nor believe, and am therefore clear of all the consequences that may arise therefrom. I believe, "a gradual improvement in grace and goodness," I mean in the knowledge and love of God, is a good "testimony of our present sincerity towards God;" although I dare not say, it is "the only true ground of humble assurance," or the only foundation on which a Christian builds his "hopes of acceptance and salvation." For I think 'other foundation' of these 'can no man lay, than that which is laid, even Jesus Christ.'

8. To the charge of holding "sinless perfection," as your lordship states it, I might likewise plead, not guilty: seeing one ingredient thereof, in your lordship's account, is "freedom from temptation," (p. 17.) Whereas I believe, 'there is no such perfection in this life, as implies an entire deliverance from manifold temptations.' But I will not decline the charge. I will repeat once more my coolest thoughts upon this head; and that in the very terms which I did several years ago, as I presume your lordship cannot be ignorant.

"What, it may be asked, do you mean by 'one that is perfect,' or, 'one that is as his Master?' We mean, one in whom is 'the Mind which was in Christ,' and who 'so walketh as he walked;' a man that 'hath clean hands and a pure heart;' or that is 'cleansed from all filthiness of flesh and spirit:' one 'in whom there is no occasion of stumbling,' and who accordingly 'doth not commit sin.' To declare this a little more particularly, we understand by that scriptural expression, 'a perfect man,' one in whom God hath fulfilled his faithful word, 'from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you.—I will also save you from all your uncleanness.' We understand hereby, one whom God hath 'sanctified throughout,' even in 'body, soul, and spirit:' one who 'walketh in the light, as he is in the light,' in whom 'is no darkness at all; the blood of Jesus Christ his Son' having 'cleansed him from all sin.'

"This man can now testify to all mankind, 'I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet I live not; but Christ liveth in me.' He 'is holy, as God who called him is holy,' both in life, and 'in all manner of conversation.' He 'loveth the Lord his God with all his heart, and serveth him with all his strength.' He 'loveth his neighbour' (every man) 'as himself;' yea, 'as Christ loved us:' them in particular that 'despitefully use him and persecute him,' because 'they know not the Son, neither the Father.' Indeed his soul is all love, filled with 'bowels of mercies, kindness, meekness, gentleness, long-suffering.' And his life agreeth thereto, full 'of the work of faith, the patience of hope, the labour of love.' And 'whatsoever he doth, either in word or deed,' he doth 'it all in the name,' in the love and power 'of the Lord Jesus.' In a word, he doth the Will of God 'on earth, as it is done in heaven.'

"This is to be 'a perfect man,' to be 'sanctified throughout, created anew in Jesus Christ:' even 'to have a heart so all-flaming with the love of God,' (to use archbishop Usher's words,) 'as continually to offer up every thought, word, and work, as a spiritual sacrifice, acceptable unto

God through Christ.' In every thought of our hearts, in every word of our tongues, in every work of our hands, 'to shew forth his praise who hath called us out of darkness into his marvellous light.' O that both we, and all who seek the Lord Jesus in sincerity, may thus 'be made perfect in one.'"

9. I conjure you, my lord, by the mercies of God, if these are not the words of truth and soberness, point me out wherein I have erred from the truth: shew me clearly, wherein I have spoken either beyond or contrary to the Word of God. But might I not humbly entreat, that your lordship, in doing this, would abstain from such expressions as these, "If they will put themselves under their direction and discipline,—after their course of discipline is once over," (p. 15,) as not suitable either to the weight of the subject, or the dignity of your lordship's character. And might I not expect something more than these loose assertions, that this is "a delusion altogether groundless," (p. 15.) "A notion contrary to the whole tenor, both of the Old and New Testament;" that "the Scriptures forbid all thought of it, as vain, arrogant, and presumptuous;" that they "represent all mankind, without distinction, as subject to sin and corruption" (subject to sin and corruption! strong words!) "during their continuance in this world: and require no more than an honest *desire* and *endeavour*, to find ourselves less and less in a state of imperfection?" (p. 16.)

Is it not from your lordship's entirely mistaking the question, not at all apprehending what perfection I teach, that you go on to guard against the same imaginary consequences, as your lordship did in *The Observations*? Surely, my lord, you never gave yourself the trouble to read the answer given in the *Further Appeal*, to every objection which you now urge afresh! seeing you do not now appear to know any more of my sentiments, than if you had never proposed one question, nor received one answer upon the subject!

10. If your lordship designed to shew my real sentiments

concerning the last *doctrine which you mention*, as one would imagine by your adding, "these are his own words," (p. 18,) should you not have cited all my own words? At least all the words of that paragraph, and not have mangled it, as Mr. Church did before?

It runs thus, (Journal IV. Vol. II. page 42.) 'Saturday 28. I shewed at large, (in order to answer those who taught, that none but they who are full of faith and the Holy Ghost, ought ever to communicate,) 1. That the *Lord's Supper* was ordained by God, to be a *mean of conveying* to men either *preventing*, or *justifying*, or *sanctifying grace*, according to their several necessities. 2. That the persons for whom it was ordained, are all those who know and feel that they *want* the *grace* of God, either to *restrain* them from sin, or to *shew their sins forgiven*, or to *renew their souls* in the image of God. 3. That inasmuch as we come to his table, not to *give* him any thing, but to *receive* whatsoever he sees best for us, there is *no previous preparation* indispensably necessary, but *a desire* to receive whatsoever he pleases to give. And, 4. That *no fitness* is required at the time of communicating, but *a sense of our state*, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness: every one who knows he is *fit for hell*, being just *fit to come to* Christ, in this as well as all other ways of his appointment.'

In the second letter to Mr. Church, I explain myself farther on this head. 'I am sorry to find you still affirm, that with regard to the *Lord's Supper* also, I "advance many injudicious, false, and dangerous things. Such as, 1. That a man ought to communicate, without a sure trust in God's mercy through Christ,"' (p. 117.) You mark these as my words; but I know them not. '2. That there is no previous preparation *indispensably* necessary, but a desire to receive whatsoever God pleases to give.' But I include abundantly more in that *desire*, than you seem to apprehend; even a willingness to know and do the whole will of God. '3. That no fitness is required at the time of communicating.' (I recite the whole sentence) 'but a sense of our state, of our utter sinfulness and helplessness!

Every one who knows he is fit for hell, being just fit to come to Christ, in this, as well as in all other ways of his appointment.' But neither can this sense of our utter sinfulness and helplessness subsist, without earnest desires of universal holiness.

10. And now what can I say? Had your lordship never seen this? That is hardly to be imagined. But if you had, how was it possible your lordship should thus explicitly and solemnly charge me, in the presence of God and all my brethren, (only, the person so charged was not present) with "meaning by those words to *set aside* self-examination and repentance for sins past, and resolutions of living better for the time to come, as things no way necessary to make a worthy communicant!" (p. 18.) If an evidence at the bar should swerve from truth, an equitable judge may place the thing in a true light. But if the judge himself shall bear false witness, where then can we find a remedy?

Actual preparation was here entirely out of the question. It might be *absolutely* and *indispensably* necessary, for any thing I had either said or *meant* to the contrary. For it was not at all in my thoughts. And the habitual preparation which I had in terms declared to be *indispensably* necessary, was 'a willingness to know and to do the whole will of God,' and 'earnest desires of universal holiness.' Does your lordship think this is "meant to set aside all repentance for sins past, and resolutions of living better for the time to come?"

11. Your lordship next falls with all your might upon that strange assertion, as you term it, 'We come to his table, not to give him any thing, but to receive whatsoever he sees best for us.' "Whereas," says your lordship, "in the exhortation *at the time* of receiving, the people are told, that they must *give* most humble and hearty thanks, and immediately *after* receiving, both minister and people join in *offering* and *presenting* themselves before God," (p. 20, 21.) O God! in what manner are the most sacred things here treated! The most venerable mysteries of our

religion! What quibbling, what playing upon words is here! 'Not to *give* him any thing.'—"Yes, to *give* him thanks." O, my lord, are these the words of a father of the church?

12. Your lordship goes on, "To the foregoing account of these modern principles and doctrines,—it may not be improper to subjoin a few observations upon the indirect *practices* of the same people in gaining proselytes," (p. 23, 24.)—"I. They persuade the people, that the *established* worship, with a regular attendance upon it, is not sufficient to answer the ends of devotion."—Your lordship mentioned this likewise in the *Observations*. In your fourth *query* it stood thus: 'Whether a due and regular attendance on the public offices of religion, paid in a serious and composed way, does not answer the true ends of devotion?' Suffer me to repeat part of the answer then given.

'I suppose, by devotion you mean public worship; by the *true ends* of it, the love of God and man; and by "a due and regular attendance on the public offices of religion, paid in a serious and composed way," the going as often as we can to our parish church, and to the sacrament there administered. If so, the question is, Whether *this attendance* on *those offices*, does not produce the love of God and man? I answer, sometimes it does; and sometimes it does not. I myself thus attended them for many years; and yet am conscious to myself, that during that whole time, I had no more of the love of God than a stone. And I know many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of serious persons, who are ready to testify the same thing.' I subjoined, '1. We continually exhort all who attend on our preaching, to attend the offices of the church. And they do pay a more regular attendance there than ever they did before. 2. Their attending the church did not, in fact, answer those ends at all, till they attended this preaching also. 3. It is the preaching remission of sins through Jesus Christ, which alone answers the true ends of devotion.'

13. II. "They censure the clergy," says your lordship, "as less zealous than themselves, in the several branches

of the ministerial function.—For this they are undeservedly reproached by these noisy, itinerant leaders." (p. 24, 25.) My lord, I am not conscious to myself of this. I do not willingly compare myself with any man, much less do I reproach my brethren of the clergy, whether they deserve it or not. But it is needless to add any more on this head than what was said above a year ago. [Second Letter to Mr. Church.]

'I must explain myself a little on that practice which you so often term *abusing the clergy*. I have many times great sorrow and heaviness in my heart, on account of these my brethren. And this sometimes constrains me to speak to them, in the only way which is now in my power: and sometimes (though rarely) to speak of them, of a few, not all in general. In either case, I take an especial care, 1. To speak nothing but the truth. 2. To speak this with all plainness; and, 3. With love, and in the spirit of meekness. Now, if you will call this *abusing*, *railing*, or *reviling*, you must. But still I dare not refrain from it. I must *thus rail*, *thus abuse* sinners of all sorts and degrees, unless I will perish with them.'

14. III. "They value themselves upon extraordinary strictnesses and severities in life, and such as are beyond what the rules of Christianity require. They captivate the people by such professions and appearances of *uncommon* sanctity.—But that which can never fail of a general respect —is a quiet and exemplary life, free from the many *follies* and *indiscretions* which those restless and vagrant teachers are apt to fall into," (p. 25.)

By "extraordinary strictnesses and severities," I presume your lordship means, the abstaining from wine and animal food; which, it is sure, Christianity does not require. But if you do, I fear your lordship is not thoroughly informed of the matter of fact. I began to do this, about twelve years ago, when I had no thought of "annoying parochial ministers," or of "captivating any people" thereby, unless it were the Chicasaw or Choctau Indians. But I resumed the use of them both, about two years after, for

the sake of some who thought I made it a point of conscience; telling them 'I will eat flesh while the world standeth, rather than make my brother to offend.' Dr. Cheyne advised me to leave them off again, assuring me, 'Till you do, you will never be free from fevers.' And since I have taken his advice, I have been free (blessed be God) from all bodily disorders.* Would to God I knew any method of being equally free from all *follies* and *indiscretions*. But this I never expect to attain, till my spirit returns to God.

15. But in how strange a manner does your lordship represent this! What a construction do you put upon it! "Appearances of an *uncommon* sanctity," in order to "captivate the people.—Pretensions to more exalted degrees of strictness, to make their way into weak minds and fickle heads," (page 25.) "Pretences to greater sanctity whereby they draw over to themselves the most ignorant of the people." (p. 4.) If these are "appearances of uncommon sanctity, (which indeed might bear a dispute) how does your lordship know, that they are only *appearances?* That they do not spring from the heart? Suppose these were "exalted degrees of strictness," is your lordship absolutely assured, that we practise them only "to make *our* way into weak minds and fickle heads?" Where is the proof, that these "pretences to greater sanctity," (as your lordship is pleased to phrase them,) are mere *pretences*, and have nothing of reality or sincerity in them?

My lord, this is an accusation of the highest nature. If we are guilty, we are not so much as moral Heathens. We are monsters not only unworthy of the Christian name, but unfit for human society. It tears up all *pretences* to the love of God and man: to justice, mercy, or truth. But how is it proved? Or does your lordship read the heart, and so pass sentence without any proof at all? O, my

* I continued this about two years.

lord, ought an accusation of the lowest kind to be thus received, even against the lowest of the people? How much less can this be reconciled with the apostolic advice to the bishop of Ephesus, 'Against a presbyter, Receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses;' and those face to face. When it is thus proved, 'them that sin, rebuke before all.' Your lordship, doubtless, remembers the words that follow, (how worthy to be written in your heart!) 'I charge thee, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality,' 1 Tim. v. 19, 20, 21.

IV. 16. "*They* mislead the people into an opinion of the *high merit* of punctual attendances on their performances, to the neglect of the business of their station," (p. 26.) My lord, this is not so. You yourself, in this very charge, have cleared us from one part of this accusation. You have borne us witness, (p. 10,) that we disclaim all *merit*, even in (really) good works: how much more, in such works as we continually declare are not good, but very evil? Such as the attending sermons, or any public offices whatever, "to the neglect of the business of our station."

When your lordship urged this before, in the *Observations*, I openly declared my belief (*Farther Appeal*, part I.) 'That true religion cannot lead into a disregard or disesteem of the common duties and offices of life: that, on the contrary, it leads men to discharge all those duties with the strictest and closest attention: that Christianity requires this attention and diligence, in all stations and in all conditions; that the performance of the lowest offices of life, *as unto God*, is truly *a serving of Christ*; and that this is the doctrine I preach continually;' a fact, whereof any man may easily be informed. Now if after all this, your lordship will repeat the charge, as if I had not once opened my mouth concerning it, I cannot help it. I can say no more. I commend my case to God.

17. Having considered what your lordship has advanced,

concerning dangerous *doctrines* and indirect *practices*, I now come to the instructions your lordship gives to the clergy of your diocese. How awful a thing is this! the very occasion carries in it a solemnity not to be expressed. Here is an angel of the church of Christ, one of the stars in God's right-hand, calling together all the subordinate pastors, for whom he is to give an account to God; and directing them (in the name and by the authority of 'the great Shepherd of the sheep, Jesus Christ, the first begotten from the dead, the Prince of the kings of the earth') how to 'make full proof of their ministry,' that they may be 'pure from the blood of all men;' how to 'take heed unto themselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers;' how to 'feed the flock of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood!' To this end they are all assembled together. And what is the substance of all his instructions? "Reverend brethren, I charge you all, lift up your voice like a trumpet! and *warn*, and *arm*, and *fortify* all mankind—against a people called Methodists."

True it is, your lordship gives them several advices; but all in order to this end. You direct them, to "inculcate the excellency of our liturgy, as a wise, grave, and serious service:" to shew "their people, that a diligent attendance on their business, is a serving of God; punctually to perform both the public offices of the church, and all other pastoral duties:" and to "engage the esteem of their parishioners, by a constant regularity of life." But all these your lordship recommends *eo nomine*, as means to that great end, "The *arming* and *fortifying* their people against the Moravians or Methodists, and their doctrines."

Is it possible! Could your lordship discern no other enemies of the Gospel of Christ? Are there no other heretics or schismatics on earth? Or even within the four seas? Are there no papists, no deists in the land? Or are their errors of less importance? Or are their numbers in England less considerable? Or less likely to increase? Does it appear then that they have lost their zeal for

making proselytes? Or, are all the people so *guarded* against them already, that their labour is in vain? Can your lordship answer these few, plain questions, to the satisfaction of your own conscience? Have the Methodists (so called) already monopolized all the sins, as well as errors in the nation? Is Methodism the only sin, or the only fatal or spreading sin, to be found within the Bills of Mortality! Have two thousand (or more) 'ambassadors of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God,' no other business than to "guard, warn, arm, and fortify" their people against this? O my lord, if this engross their time and strength, (as it must, if they follow your lordship's instructions,) they will not give an account with joy, either of themselves or of their flock in that day!

11. Your lordship seems in some measure sensible of this, when you very gently condemn their opinion who think the "Methodists might better be disregarded and despised, than taken notice of and opposed—if it were not for the disturbance they give to the parochial ministers, and their unwarrantable endeavours to seduce the people from their lawful pastors," (p. 22.) The same complaint with which your lordship opened your charge. "They give shameful disturbances to the parochial clergy—they annoy the established ministry, using very unwarrantable methods, first, to prejudice their people against them, and then to seduce their flocks from them," (p. 4.)

Whether we seduce them or not, (which will be presently considered,) I am sorry your lordship should give any countenance to that low, senseless, and now generally exploded slander, that we do it for a maintenance. This your lordship insinuates, by applying to us those words of Bishop Saunderson, 'And all this, to serve their own belly, to make a prey of the poor deluded proselytes: for, by this mean, the people fall unto them, and thereout suck they no small advantage," (p. 15.) Your lordship cannot but know, that my fellowship, and my brother's studentship, afford us more than sufficient for life and godliness: espe-

cially, for that manner of life which we choose, whether out of ostentation or in sincerity.

19. But do we willingly "annoy the established ministry," or "give disturbance to the parochial clergy?" My lord, we do not. We trust, herein, to have a conscience void of offence. Nor do we designedly "prejudice their people against them." In this also our heart condemneth us not. But you "seduce their flocks from them." No, not even from those who feed themselves, not the flock. All who hear us attend the service of the church, at least as much as they did before. And for this very thing, are we reproached as *bigots to the church*, by those of most other denominations.

Give me leave, my lord, to say, you have mistook and misrepresented this whole affair from the top to the bottom. And I am the more concerned to take notice of this, because so many have fallen into the same mistake. It is indeed, and has been from the beginning, the πρωτον ψευδος, the capital blunder of our bitterest adversaries: though how they can advance it, I see not, without *loving*, if not *making a lie*. It is not our care, endeavour, or desire, to *proselyte* any from one man to another, or from one church, (so called) from one congregation, or society to another: (we would not move a finger to do this: to make ten thousand such proselytes,) but from darkness to light, from Belial to Christ; from the power of Satan to God. Our one aim is, to proselyte sinners to repentance, the servants of the devil to serve the living and true God. If this be not done in fact, we will stand condemned; not as well-meaning fools, but as devils incarnate. But if it be, if the instances glare in the face of the sun, if they increase daily, maugre all the power of earth and hell: then, my lord, neither you nor any man beside (let me use great plainness of speech) can "oppose and fortify people against us," without being found 'even to fight against God.'

20. I would fain set this point in a clearer light. Here are, in and near Moorfields, ten thousand poor souls for

whom Christ died, rushing headlong into hell. Is Dr. Bulkely, the parochial minister, both willing and able to stop them? If so, let it be done, and I have no place in these parts. I go and call other sinners to repentance. But if after all he has done, and all he can do, they are still in the broad way to destruction, let me see if God will put a word, even in my mouth. True, I am a poor worm that of myself can do nothing. But if God sends, by whomsoever he will send, his Word shall not return empty. All the messenger of God asks, is, Δος τω ςω; (no help of man!) και γην κινησω· The arm of the Lord is revealed? The lion roars, having the prey plucked out of his teeth. And 'there is joy in the presence of the angels of God, over' more than 'one sinner that repenteth.'

21. Is this any *annoyance* to the parochial minister? Then what manner of spirit is he of? Does he look on this part of his flock as lost, because they are found of the great Shepherd?—My lord, great is my boldness towards you. You speak of the *consequences* of our doctrines. You seem well pleased with the success of your *endeavours* against them, because (you say) they "have pernicious consequences, are big with pernicious influences upon practice,—dangerous to religion and the souls of men," (p. 8, 22.) In answer to all this, I appeal to plain fact. I say once more, 'What have been the *consequences* (I would not speak, but I dare not refrain) of the doctrines I have preached for nine years last past? By the fruits shall ye know those of whom I speak: even the cloud of witnesses, who at this hour experience the gospel which I preach, to be the power of God unto salvation. The habitual drunkard, that was, is now temperate in all things. The whoremonger now flees fornication. He that stole steals no more, but works with his hands. He that cursed or swore, perhaps at every sentence, has now learned to serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice unto him with reverence. Those formerly enslaved to various habits of sin, are now brought to uniform habits of holiness. These are demonstrable facts. I can name the men, with their places

of abode. One of them was an avowed Atheist for many years; some were Jews; a considerable number Papists: the greatest part of them as much strangers to the form, as to the power of godliness.'

My lord, can you deny these facts? I will make whatever proof of them you shall require. But if the facts be allowed, who can deny the doctrines to be (in substance) the Gospel of Christ? 'For is there any other name under heaven given to men, whereby they may' thus 'be saved?' Or is there any other word that thus 'commendeth itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God?'

22. But I must draw to a conclusion. Your lordship has, without doubt, had some success in *opposing* this doctrine. Very many have, by your lordship's unwearied *endeavours*, been deterred from hearing at all: and have thereby probably escaped the being *seduced* into holiness, have lived and died in their sins. My lord, the time is short. I am past the noon of life, and my remaining years flee away as a shadow. Your lordship is old and full of days, having past the usual age of man. It cannot, therefore, be long before we shall both drop this house of earth, and stand naked before God: no, nor before we shall see the great white Throne coming down from heaven, and him that sitteth thereon. On his left-hand shall be those who are shortly to dwell in everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. In that number will be all who died in their sins: and, among the rest, those whom you *preserved* from repentance. Will you then rejoice in your success? The Lord God grant it may not be said in that hour, 'These have perished in their iniquity: but their blood I require at thy hands.'

I am, your lordship's dutiful son and servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

LONDON, *June* 11, 1747.

A

LETTER

TO A

CLERGYMAN.

TULLAMORE, MAY 4, 1748.

REVEREND SIR,

I HAVE, at present, neither leisure nor inclination to enter into a formal controversy: but you will give me leave, just to offer a few loose hints, relating to the subject of last night's conversation.

1. Seeing life and health are things of so great importance, it is, without question, highly expedient, that physicians should have all possible advantages of learning and education.

2. That trial should be made of them by competent judges, before they practise publickly.

3. That after such trial, they be authorised to practise by those who are empowered to convey that authority.

4. And that while they are preserving the lives of others, they should have what is sufficient to sustain their own.

5. But supposing a gentleman bred at the University in Dublin, with all the advantages of education: after he has undergone all the usual trials, and then been regularly authorised to practise,

6. Suppose, I say, this physician settles at —— for some years, and yet makes no cures at all; but, after trying his skill on five hundred persons, cannot shew that he has healed one; many of his patients dying under his hands, and the rest remaining just as they were before he came;

7. Will you condemn a man, who, having some little skill in physic, and a tender compassion for those who are sick or dying all around him, cures many of those, without fee or reward, whom the doctor could not cure?

8. At least, *did* not, (which is the same thing as to the case in hand,) were it only for this reason, because he did not go to them, and they would not come to him?

9. Will you condemn him, because he has not learning? Or has not had an university education? What then? He cures those whom the man of learning and education could not cure.

10. Will you object, that he is no physician, nor has any authority to practise? I cannot come into your opinion. I think, he is a physician who heals; *Medicus est qui medetur:* and that every man has authority to save the life of a dying man. But if you only mean, he has no authority to take fees, I contend not: for he takes none at all.

11. Nay, and I am afraid it will hold, on the other hand, *Medicus non est qui non medetur:* I am afraid, if we use propriety of speech, he is no physician who works no cure.

12. "O, but he has taken his degree of doctor of physic, and, therefore, has authority." Authority to do what? "Why to heal all the sick that will employ him." But, (to wave the case of those who will not employ him: and would you have even *their* lives thrown away?) he does not heal those that do employ him. He that was sick before, is sick still; or else he is gone hence, and is no more seen.—Therefore his authority is not worth a rush; for it serves not the end for which it was given.

13. And surely he has no authority to kill them, by hindering another from saving their lives!

14. If he either attempts or desires to hinder him, if he condemns or dislikes him for it, it is plain to all thinking men, he regards his own fees, more than the lives of his patients.

II. Now to apply. 1. Seeing life everlasting and holiness, or health of soul, are things of so great importance, it is highly expedient, that ministers, being physicians of the soul, should have all advantages of education and learning:

2. That full trial should be made of them, in all respects, and that by the most competent judges, before they enter on the public exercise of their office, The saving souls from death:

3. That after such trial, they should be authorised to exercise that office, by those who are empowered to convey that authority: (I believe, bishops are empowered to do this, and have been so, from the apostolic age:)

4. And that those, whose souls they save, ought, mean time, to provide them what is needful for the body.

5. But suppose a gentleman bred at the University in Dublin, with all the advantages of education: after he has undergone the usual trials, and been regularly authorized to save souls from death;

6. Suppose, I say, this minister settles at ——, for some years, and yet saves no souls at all: saves no sinners from their sins; but after he has preached all this time to five or six hundred persons, cannot shew, that he has converted one from the error of his ways. Many of his parishioners dying as they lived, and the rest remaining just as they were before he came;

7. Will you condemn a man, who, having compassion on dying souls, and some knowledge of the Gospel of Christ, without any temporal reward, saves many from their sins, whom the minister could not save?

8. At least, *did* not: nor ever was likely to do it; for he did not go to them, and they would not come to him.

9. Will you condemn such a preacher, because he has not learning? Or has not had an university education?—What then? He saves those sinners from their sins, whom the man of learning and education could not save.—A peasant being brought before the college of physicians at Paris, a learned doctor accosted him, "What, friend, do you pretend to prescribe to people that have agues? Dost thou know what an ague is?" He replied, "Yes, Sir, an ague is, what I can cure, and you cannot."

10. Will you object, "But he is no minister; nor has any authority to save souls?" I must beg leave to dissent from you in this. I think he is a true, evangelical minister, διακονος, servant of Christ and his church, who αυτως διακονει, so ministers, as to save souls from death, to reclaim sinners from their sins: and that every Christian, if he is able to do it, has authority to save a dying soul.—But if you only mean, he has no authority to take tythes. I grant it. He takes none. As he has freely received, so he freely gives.

11. But to carry the matter a little farther, I am afraid, it will hold on the other hand, with regard to the soul as well as the body, *Medicus non est qui non medetur*. I am afraid, reasonable men will be much inclined to think, he that saves no souls is no minister of Christ.

12. "O, but he is ordained, and therefore has authority." Authority to do what? To save all the souls that will put themselves under his care. True; but (to wave the case of them that will not: And would you desire that even those should perish?) he does not, in fact, save them that are under his care. Therefore what end does his authority serve? He that was a drunkard, is a drunkard still. The same is true of the sabbath-breaker, the thief, the common swearer. This is the best of the case: for many have died in their iniquity, and their blood will God require at the watchman's hand.

13. For surely he has no authority to murder souls: either by his neglect, by his smooth if not false doctrine, or

by hindering another from plucking them out of the fire, and bringing them to life everlasting.

14. If he either attempts or desires to hinder him, if he condemns or is displeased with him for it, how great reason is there to fear, that he regards his own profit, more than the salvation of souls!

I am, Reverend Sir,

Your affectionate brother,

JOHN WESLEY.

END OF VOL. TWELVE.

CONFERENCE-OFFICE, 14, CITY-ROAD;
T. CORDEUX, AGENT.

SEP 23 1940